PEN-PORTRAITS ESSAYS AND ADDRESSES

BY

SIR. C. P. RAMASWAMI AIYAR

HIND KITABS LIMITED

04

In this book the distinguished author deals with a variety of subjects—cultural, biographical, political, economic and scientific.

Besides the vigorous personality of a famous administrator, they display his keen and active intellect and his felicity of phrase and expression.

Young and old will read this book with pleasure and profit.

Rs. 6-8

PEN-PORTRAITS, ESSAYS
AND
ADDRESSES

PEN-PORTRAITS, ESSAYS
AND
ADDRESSES

BY

SIR C. P. RAMASWAMI AIYAR

HIND KITABS LIMITED

PUBLISHERS - - - BOMBAY

July 1948

COPYRIGHT

Printed by G. G. Pathare at the Popular Press (Bom.) Ltd., 35 Tardeo Road, Bombay 7 and published by V. Kulkarni, Hind Kitabs Ltd., 261-263 Hornby Road, Bombay

CONTENTS

		Page
1.	WHAT IS CULTURE?	1
2.	RT. HON. V. S. SRINIVASA SASTRI'S LETTERS	6
3.	PLANNING FOR THE FUTURE	17
4.	THE FEDERAL IDEA	40
5.	A FAMILY OF PATRIOTS	81
6.	RANADE AND HIS TIMES	85
7.	DR. ANNIE BESANT	94
8.	POST-WAR RECONSTRUCTION ON A UNIFIED ALL-INDIA BASIS	106
9.	THE STUDY AND PRACTICE OF LAW IN INDIA	115
10.	BOOKS THAT HAVE INFLUENCED ME	120
11.	PRACTICAL PHILOSOPHY	125
12.	AT THE CROSS ROADS	136
13.	PALLIVASAL HYDRO-ELECTRIC SCHEME	172
14.	UNIVERSITY IDEALS IN INDIA—ANCIENT AND MODERN—I	182
	UNIVERSITY IDEALS IN INDIA—ANCIENT AND MODERN—II	188
15.	FUNDAMENTALS OF HINDU FAITH	193
16.	HINDU CULTURE	212
17.	SRI TYAGARAJA BRAHMAM AND HIS TIMES	231

1. WHAT IS CULTURE?*

When the word 'Culture' is uttered, there is a tendency in some quarters to confound it with something highbrow and affected. It is apt to be regarded as something apart from daily life and its struggles and limitations. It is now and then confused with some special mode of dress or certain forms of speech or some habits of thought by assuming which its professors are supposed to behave differently from the rest of humanity. No doubt, culture has its charlatans and pretenders as have most arts and philosophies. But rightly understood, culture is no more and no less than the art of living an enlightened life and it may be justly claimed for it, as by the Stoic Emperor, that nothing that appertains to humanity is foreign to it. Voltaire ends his most famous story depicting the chequered adventures of a philosopher in search of happiness and the El Dorado with the words 'Let us cultivate our gardens', meaning thereby that in the actual and joyous fulfilment of the daily work in the right spirit and with the right perspective, lies true culture and true happiness. It is on such aspects that I propose to dwell for a few moments in the talk which I have been privileged to give today by the courtesy of the All-India Radio.

Not many days ago, I was asked to give a message to the graduates of the Travancore University after they had received their degrees and on that occasion I referred to a passage from the Taittiriya Upanishad as summarising the elements of true culture. The passage exhorts the students of those days, who emerged from their pupilage in the Indian Forest Universities to speak the truth and do their daily duty and adds that there should be no neglect of

* A Broadcast Talk on 24th November 1940.

daily reading, daily reflection and daily teaching; but it does not stop there. For, the Upanishad proceeds to emphasize that there should be no neglect of efficiency and skill of bodily alertness or of worldly affairs and no turning away from those means that lead to worldly prosperity. It is impossible to recapture the rhythm and the impressiveness of the original but my object in adverting to the old Scripture was to point out the many-sidedness and the composite character of true culture as here envisaged.

Culture or cultivation is not a matter of acquiring an accent or a knowledge of language. It does not need the acquisition of any jargon—artistic or otherwise. It should not be confused with a display of superiority or incomprehensibility.

Culture is not solely based on wide reading or scholarship though these are often associated with it. Some of the most conspicuous exponents and examples of culture, the Lord Buddha, for instance and Socrates were probably not versed in book lore. It does not only mean the appreciation and enjoyment of art in its manifold forms though it is difficult to conceive of a person as truly cultured who is not responsive to the appeal of great architecture, of statuary and painting or the inspiration of music. What is required and demanded of the cultured individual is not that he has learnt much and filled his mind and soul but the harmonious result on him of the influences of nature, art, and literature as well as of life. One of the greatest of poets has defined the right attitude of a human being towards life and life's problems as comprehended in the words 'Ripeness is all.' This ripeness excludes not merely crudeness of thought and behaviour but all extremes of conduct and judgment. It is incommensurate with sanctimonious hypocrisy or that intolerance which avers that my 'doxy' is orthodoxy and yours heterodoxy. A most important and formative element

in culture is the concourse and friendship of men that matter. Landor puts into the mouth of Pericles the sentiment that the festival of life would have been incomplete in his own case if he had not lived with such men as his contemporaries, the great poets, dramatists and philosophers of Greece and enjoyed their familiarity and esteem and thus fitted himself to be a faithful guardian of Greek destinies.

With all these elements, moreover, has to be joined that which perhaps is most needed at this time and that which in the classic Apology of Socrates is strongly advocated, namely, that a life without investigation is not worthy for a man to live.

I have cited these examples for the purpose of illustrating how true culture has been viewed by some of the greatest men who have lived. It were best perhaps to describe it succinctly not so much as a possession of this gift, or the other, as the adoption and maintenance of a certain special attitude towards this life and the life beyond. A cultured man seeks to acquire knowledge, both the knowledge of power and the knowledge of beauty. His emotions are trained and refined by the study of high literature and the contemplation of great works of art; but he refrains from mere academic theorising or lofty aloofness. Culture which does not involve contacts with life and all its roughnesses and smoothnesses is a plant without a root. This is the reason why the seer in the Upanishad insists on efficiency in the ordinary duties of life as a *sine qua non* of culture. Such contacts will alone enable the possessor to be free from that worst form of intolerance which is intellectual arrogance and self-segregation.

There is also the danger that a too exclusive addiction either to the sciences or the arts produces a fanaticism which may be as deleterious as the fanaticism of the ultra-doctrinaire. The avoidance of such lopsidedness was sought to be produced in ancient India by the

insistence of the householder living the normal life and earning his living and supporting his family before he betook himself to the things of the spirit. A full life is a condition precedent to the supreme culture of renunciation.

The art of expounding one's ideas was again and again emphasized both in ancient Greece and in ancient India, firstly because truth and knowledge are always the better for propagation and also because true wisdom can never be tested and examined unless the process of discussion and argument accompanies it. One of the dangers of the modern system is that over-specialization has become an accompaniment of scientific and philosophic development. The biologist intent upon the study of micro-organisms, the chemist in his laboratory and the astronomer among the stars tends to lose a sense of perspective and proportion—a loss which is no less characteristic of the strenuous politician and the official or administrator engrossed in his particular matter. Each of these is apt to regard his work as the fulcrum of existence; and a corrective has always to be applied to the views and ideals of such persons.

One of the main reasons for the catastrophic developments that we are now witnessing in the world is perhaps the exclusive and aggressive devotion of the scientist to his *forte* and the preoccupation of the teachers of the world with the non-moral aspects of education. Not less baneful has been the narrowly commercial and economic outlook that has produced the universal and illogical craze of self-sufficiency, whereby a small group of nations endeavours to produce everything for itself and to sell as much as possible to its neighbours and at the same time to keep out everything from outside. Specialization, narrowness, exploitation, the deliberate ignoring of the neighbour's point of view have all been exemplified in the present conflict and are, in the opinion of many that count, the result

of wrong national education and the absence of true culture. In the ultimate analysis, therefore, culture involves and implies a vivid awareness of the meaning of life, a conspectus of the world's problems in the proper order and relative importance and the deliberate choice of the things that are really worth while.

Religion, as distinguished from dogma or specific creed, must be an integral part of all true culture, a religion which will not descend to posturing or fanaticism, which will be constantly aware of the great forces that mould the destinies of the world and will yet be wholly consistent with charity, comprehension and tolerance and a mellow understanding of the drawbacks and handicaps of oneself and society; a religion which may perhaps be best described as a constant and instructed criticism of life and a constant understanding of the difficulties of one's neighbours. To strive for the best and yet be content with what alone is often attainable, namely, the second best—this should be the mark of the truly cultivated person.

Let me endeavour to summarise the essentials of culture by invoking the words of a modern poet who is not as well-known as he should be:

'To things, not phantoms, let us cleave—
The gains of science, the gifts of art;
The sense of oneness with our kind;
The thirst to know and understand—
A large and liberal discontent,
These are the goods in life's rich hand
The things that are more excellent.'

2. RT. HON. V. S. SRINIVASA SASTRI'S LETTERS*

Letter-writing is a familiar occupation and is seemingly easy; but mastery in that art is perhaps rarer than in most other forms of literary effort. One of the finest artists in this line was Madame de Sevigne, who lived in 17th Century France and whose epistles to her daughter and her friends have furnished inimitable specimens of thought and style both gay and grave. In his preface to a recent edition of her letters, Emile Faguet, himself a great *litterateur*, puts himself the question as to why her epistles occupy the place they do in French literature. His answer may be freely translated. "Because, marvellously endowed by nature and well-instructed, she did not dream of writing excepting as she spoke and except in the style which was natural to her personality and which was not forced—a style which, in the quaint language of Montaigne, was the same at the end of her pen as in her mouth."

Judged by this difficult test, the Right Hon'ble Srinivasa Sastri will emerge successfully: and that is saying a great deal. Some letter-writers have evinced a tendency towards exaggerated self-revelation and towards over-emphasis. There are others who display an irritating reserve and reticence. Even a writer's vocabulary may mark him out as of this school or that. He may prefer certain kinds of sentences or periods, plain or figurative statements, brief or extended illustrations. And as is evident from more than one letter addressed to Mahadev Desai, Sastri not only busies himself with syntax but also with punctuation.

Srinivasa Sastri represents a rare and special type. Starting as a schoolmaster, he learnt early to analyse as

*A Review of "The Letters of the Rt. Honourable V S. Srinivasa Sastri". It appeared in the 'Hindu' of 9th April, 1944.

well as to lecture to himself and others. His self-portraiture in these letters discloses a rather peremptory attitude towards the members of his family who were naturally very doubtful of the wisdom of his resolve to jettison his profession and to ally himself with the Servants of India. The schoolmaster and the rigid moralist is evident in his make-up: but he has grown, or rather has been making a continuous attempt to move away, from that attitude. Sastri is a man who has taught himself many things and whose tastes are catholic as well as keen. He is neither ascetic nor anchorite by temperament, although in more than one letter he reveals himself as fortified by a philosophy rather of stoicism than of an assurance born of a wrestling with the eternal verities. No juster characterisation of Sastri's outlook towards his friends can be conceived than the following passage extracted from one of the letters of another courageous battler with Fate, Robert Louis Stevenson. "To renounce when that shall be necessary and not be embittered—to keep a few friends, but these without capitulation; above all, on the same grim condition to keep friends with himself; here is a task for all that a man has of fortitude and delicacy."

Lord Willingdon's offer of a safe and well-paid sinecure, the Presidentship of the Council of State, was rejected by Sastri in language which cannot be bettered. Ease, honour and dignity were put on the one side and I personally know what a profound impression this letter made on the Viceroy. As is evident from the letter of the 2nd November 1932, written at a time when I knew that there was considerable opposition to the selection of Sastri for work in England, it was my good fortune to suggest that his advice should be made continuous and formally available in India and the letter from the Viceroy and Sastri's reply of the 12th November are alike memorable for what is concealed and for what is revealed. Just as Sastri has not known until

this moment of the part I played in this episode, I did not know until I read these letters how he thought of me in 1921 in connection with a deputation to the Dominions.

This is not a merely egotistic *aside* but is mentioned to illustrate the essential characteristics of Sastri. "It is the merit and preservation of friendship", says Thoreau, "that it takes place on a level higher than the actual characters of the parties would seem to warrant. We are different with different friends but with each friend, although we could not distinguish it in words from any other, we have at least one special reputation to preserve. We run to our friend or our lover not to hear ourselves called better but to be better men in point of fact". These words are an epitome and the summation of the correspondence collected in this volume.

Without pedantic elaboration but in a series of deft and simple pen-pictures, we glimpse in the book before us scenes of extraordinary and arresting variety. The letter to Gokhale, with which this series starts, appropriately begins with the offer of Sastri's services to him in terms at once as full of self-respect as of humility. Mrs. Sastri was evidently opposed to the step. Tears, in his own words, are hard arguments to answer; but they were answered and Sastri was very soon in the thick of the propaganda in connection with Gokhale's Education Bill. Already in 1907 the temperamental collisions between the *Moderate's* programme and the doctrines of boycott and non-co-operation had started. Some men had lost faith in agitation, and on the 9th of February 1907, Gokhale is told that the Moderates are nowhere excepting amongst the Mussalmans. In East Bengal the portent of the times was specially marked. As late as 1911, the members of the Servants of India Society were watched by the C.I.D. although the Governor of Madras is reported to have spoken for one hour

and forty-five minutes with Sastri. Gokhale's Education Bill, although approved of by Bishop and Mrs. Whitehead in Madras, was still an object of suspicion to the normal official. One of Sastri's great friends and supporters, Mr. V. Krishnaswami Aiyar, had already in 1911 begun to influence Sastri powerfully. Sastri's affection for that great and torrential personality did not, however, conquer his sense of humour and he pokes playful fun at Krishnaswami Aiyar's resolve to discard the *dhoti* in Ootacamund and to eat vegetarian food prepared by Mrs. Whitehead. These were great reforms in those days, attempted as they were by an extremely orthodox person. Those were days, moreover, when members of Council like Atkinson could be surprised by the recognition afforded by the Governor and Mr. Krishnaswami Aiyar to a member of the Servants of India Society and when he can be asked, "I see you are stopping with the Bishop and his wife. Have you really dropped caste?"

We get a glimpse of the background of those times when we find it stated that the grant of the Local, Municipal, Salt and Abkari portfolios to Mr. Krishnaswami Aiyar when he became member of the Madras Executive Council was regarded as a memorable event and when Sastri was able to say that all this was His Excellency's doing and that Mr. Krishnaswami Aiyar seems to have satisfied Government that he is absolutely safe. In the same year, Sastri's lectures were prohibited in Mysore by the Dewan Ananda Rao, although Ex-Dewan Mr. V. P. Madhava Rao was to have presided over one of them.

The letters contained in the book under review prove beyond cavil what has always been the contention of Sastri's friends that he has been perhaps the most extreme of the *Moderates*. He was able to say, as early as 1907, that resolution and grimness are the elements that our patriotism needs now. On another occasion,

recounting the conversation with the late Gaekwar of Baroda and referring to a speech that he delivered under the Maharaja's presidency, Sastri likens bureaucracy to a wanton with insatiable appetite for homage and the gifts of love.

That Sastri is not insensible of appreciation and praise and is very human in his anxiety to please and be judged aright, is clear at every stage. He is human enough to be pleased with the homage that was paid to his rare eloquence and his meticulous phrasing by the Duke of Connaught and the Duke of Devonshire, by the members of the British Cabinet and by statesmen in Australia and Canada. That he is quite honest about his feelings (although naturally he confesses them only to those dear and near to him) is, in my opinion, a thing to be set down in his favour and not in his debit. We are glad to see him off his pedestal now and then.

His first reaction to the Russian Revolution was expressed in a letter to his dear and constant friend, V. Krishnaswami Aiyar: "If we could but lift ourselves from the slough of smug respectability and the regularised order of our society, we might have a taste, hot and unforgettable, of real life as it is lived in a world of daring aspiration, ceaseless endeavour and delirious excitement, and uncertainty". Sastri's temperament, however, is a mixture of the daring and cautious. Having said this, he adds: "The fascination amounts to a vertigo and, to feeble and enthusiastic natures, may be irresistible." The personality revealed in this volume is of a lover of the fine arts and of all the amenities and emotions of a full life with strongly developed domestic affections and also, fortunately, with a capacity for humour that is often displayed in such descriptions as those of Rao Bahadur A. Krishnaswami Aiyar. He unites with those endowments an uncommon capacity for self-analysis and self-judgment.

The Montagu letters are some of the finest in the

collection and the mutual generosity of judgment and frankness of communication that have been revealed in them are creditable to both the parties and demonstrate also that they were united in their love of India and their aspirations for its future.

A letter to G. A. Natesan regarding the volcanic Bepin Chandra Pal is an indication of Sastri's careful and conscientious judgment of men. Attacking as he does the boycott of work and association with Government and the meagreness of constructive effort on the part of the *Extremist* party, he is yet able to say that the manifestation of their virulence will make the forward movement in India outwardly discredited but inwardly stronger and more firm-based. At present the party's personnel is feeble, he adds, but succeeding generations will contribute more character, virility and persistence to the party.

One of his characteristics which many, including myself, have regretted deeply is the inescapable self-distrust of Sastri. I noticed it on more than one occasion during the Round Table Conference, when I found to my sorrow that he was too balanced and too self-critical to assert himself and to grasp the leadership which it was his duty as well as his right to assume. It is true, as he says in a letter of 1915, that his moods of depression are common. He goes so far as to add that they are often so deep as to bring suicide within sight. Such moods are, in fact, inseparable from what he himself notes as self-suppression and morbidly critical temper hardly distinguishable from cynicism. Many of us have wished that Sastri would shed this quality and that although he may not, in his own language, be bursting with a message to the world, he will at least not put needless fetters on himself. This quality has led to his comparative sterility as a writer. He has the makings of a great biographer and historian but he will not shed his shyness. A biography by him of Mr. Gokhale and

those that surrounded him and opposed him and a history of our own times written by him would be valuable at all times but invaluable at this period of the country's history.

To all readers, however, the most fascinating part of this volume would be not the discussion or the description of the Round Table and Imperial Conferences, not Sastri's contacts with statesmen in England, the Dominions and South Africa but his marvellous friendship with Mahatma Gandhi and the reactions and the repurcussions of their amity. Gandhiji in 1915 is described by Sastri as a man of modest, downward face and retiring speech. On condition that he dropped his anarchist views and adopted the opinions of Gokhale and the Servants of India Society, the idea was to enrol him as a member of that Society. That consummation was not achieved and Gandhiji went his own way but outer opposition did not affect inner harmony and the letters that have passed between Sastri and Gandhiji on the one hand and Mahadev Desai on the other, demonstrate a combination of qualities and circumstances which is as precious as it is uncommon. In a memorable essay on *Friendship,* Lord Bacon says, " there is as much difference between the counsel that a friend giveth and that a man giveth himself as there is between the counsel of a friend and of a flatterer. For there is no such flatterer as is a man's self and there is no such remedy against flattery of a man's self as the liberty of a friend". The extent to which that liberty has been exercised on both sides is one of the marvels of latter-day Indian life and that such a friendship could exist between such opposing temperaments is one of the things that make us cherish great hopes for the future of our land.

Gandhiji has said, "As the public know, Sastri and I have opposite views on many important questions. Our mutual regard and affection have never suffered on that account. There is no reason whatsoever why the same

rule cannot be extended to parties and groups representing opposite schools of opinions." In January 1916, Gandhiji anticipated an adverse verdict as to his entry into the Servants of India Society; and ultimately with a frankness wholly characteristic of him, Gandhiji stated that he would, as a member, become a disturbing factor, his plans and the methods of the Society being so totally different in many respects. Whether in asking Sastri's opinion about joining the Home Rule League or in expressing his opinion on the Montagu Scheme or in putting before his friend many delicate and personal matters, there were no reservations on the side of Gandhiji nor many on Sastri's part. Very early in the course of their correspondence, the special emphasis that Gandhiji always laid on fasting and prayer was clearly expressed and he definitely laid down that, according to him, fasting and prayer with intelligence, honesty and intensity, would bring about many results of national importance without elaborate organisation and checks upon checks—fasting, according to Gandhiji, being the crucifixion of the flesh with a corresponding freedom of spirit, and prayer being the definite longing of the soul to the utterly pure, the purity thus attained being dedicated to the realisation of a particular object. Sastri's views although not fully expressed can be inferred, but in spite of such a fundamental opposition each had full confidence in the other's essential good faith and patriotism. Between 1927 and 1930 there was manifested by Gandhiji complete support of Sastri's programme and work in South Africa to which place Gandhiji suggested that he should be sent, and it is remarkable that Sastri enjoyed the unstinted confidence of the Government of India on the one hand and of Gandhiji on the other throughout his African sojourn. To illustrate the nature of their communion, one may instance a letter from Yeravada prison by Gandhiji, on the 20th September 1932, where he calls

Sastri his "blood brother" and adds that "though we are poles apart in our mental outlook, on so many points our hearts are one. I do not want you to cease to strive with me." Equally frankly, speaking of the 'Inner Voice' to which Gandhiji adverted, Sastri adverts to the story called *Ardath* by 'Ouida' where the hero has a friendly critic whose business is to be a professional fault-finder and he likens himself to that critic. In answer, Gandhiji speaks of Sardar Patel as also a critic and a jester, but he supplements this with rare candour by noting that Sardar will not do what Sastri can be trusted to do. "Unlike Sastri, Sardar has the rigid habit of finally saying 'Yes' to what I say and that is a bad habit."

Forthright and candid criticism can hardly go further than in the letter of the 7th May 1933 to Gandhiji, where, quoting Kalidasa, Sastri applies to his friend a line—*Vichara-Moodhah Pratibhasi Me Tvam*—"You appear, to me to be confounded by anxious thought", and observes: "Too much of self-communion has undermined your judgment." After saying this, Sastri, later in the same year, makes an appeal to Gandhiji to pursue Civil Disobedience by himself but to leave the Congress. He proceeds: "There is no self-effacement to which you are not equal". The answer was of a piece with Gandhiji's whole character and make-up. He says, "I quite agree with you that I am wholly unfit for constitution-building. It will come only when the nation has developed a sanction for itself."

Sastri then pleaded for Congress being freed from Gandhiji's rule and queried: "Must you, like the British *Raj*, put off the consummation till it becomes inevitable?" Gandhiji rejecting his advice remarks: "I want you to continue to strive with me and believe, as Gokhale believed of me, that whilst I often appeared to be uncompromising, I had a compromising and accommodating nature."

One of the remarkable by-products of this friend-

ship was that, silently and in secret, Sastri set himself to the task of correcting and editing the Autobiography of Gandhiji and devoted himself to the work of proof-reading and punctuation, not to mention more vital matters. The correspondence with Mahadev Desai on these topics is one that should not be missed.

Montagu says in one of his letters about Churchill: "We have to pay the price of genius and Churchill's failing is his inability, when he talks, to leave out anything which is bubbling in his mind." Such little pen-pictures abound in this volume and add a rare historical interest to the collection.

Of almost equal importance with the correspondence with Gandhiji have been the letters by Sastri to Mr. Hope Simpson and to Mr. Ramsay MacDonald.

This volume achieves finally and with conspicuous success this result, viz., placing before us the portrait of a finished and conscientious literary artist, of a man who appreciates the good things of the world and its esteem and love, who hungers for sympathy and who is all the time an exacting critic and judge of himself. His politics and his programme of work have found many critics but few can resist the appeal of the engaging personality whose thoughts, spoken and unspoken, and whose attitude towards life and its problems are disclosed in this arresting publication.

It is appropriate that the book should be dedicated to Mr. T. R. Venkatarama Sastri, who is Srinivasa Sastri's devout *chela* and admirer and also an unobstrusive and sympathetic critic. Speaking of the support that he extended to the Montagu-Chelmsford proposals, in opposition to the Indian National Congress, he sent a letter to Venkatarama Sastri in which he says, "I am conscious of the great anxiety that friends like you are feeling on my account. That I have such friends answering to the *Kural's* description, 'coming involuntarily to assistance like the hand to other parts of the body' is

a blessing for which I feel more thankful than I can tell." The volume may be epitomised as a record of rare and precious friendships couched in language of appealing candour.

3. PLANNING FOR THE FUTURE*

My primary obligation today is to thank those responsible for this great gathering for having given me the opportunity to deliver the Jubilee Memorial Lecture in pursuance of a scheme which was sponsored and has been later on implemented under very distinguished auspices. It was with great alacrity that I accepted the invitation of the organizers and I have chosen as my subject 'Planning for the Future.'

The topic, by its very nature, is so wide and all-embracing that anything or a series of nothings can be said by a speaker charged with the duty of fulfilling his obligation. I am approaching the task with the full consciousness that no more urgent and important work lies ahead of us than to discuss this subject from all points of view and to formulate and carry out, without delay, well-devised schemes of re-construction. We are all aware that this matter has been engaging the attention of people throughout the ages. *Rama Rajya* and Plato's *Republic* are amongst the earliest ideal Commonwealths of which humanity has dreamt and in their own way Swift's masterpiece *Gulliver's Travels,* and Voltaire's *Candide* may be described both as devastating criticisms of contemporary life and as pre-figurings of what the world may become. And, just running our eyes over the productions of great men—prophets, scholars, and philosophers—who have tried to picture a new world, we have an imposing array of illuminating sketches, although they are not always mutually reconcilable. Indeed, this business is as old as humanity and is part of our eternal quest in which each of us—big and small—willy-nilly joins. With regard to what I

* The Jubilee Memorial Lecture delivered at the Maharaja's College, Ernakulam, on 17th December, 1943.

shall say, I do not expect complete agreement, but my purpose is mainly to invite comment and criticism. In such discussions it is necessary that all conceivable arguments should be set out, controverted or dissented from, so that out of the clash of opinions a *via media* may be reached and a new approach devised, if possible.

Let us consider the type of problem that was attacked by those who have sought to essay similar tasks in the past. Plato's *Republic* is a well known account of an ideal State where wise men carefully chosen were to rule the State in the capacity of philosopher-kings. Plutarch's *Lycurgus*, More's *Utopia* which was written with a view to the possibilities of the newly discovered American continent, Bacon's *New Atlantis* which was a similar anticipation of the Australian continent, and Campanella's *City of the Sun* which was a diatribe on the society of his days, belong to the past as also do Rousseau's dreams and Marx's theories. Coming down to our own days, we see that H. G. Wells' *Outlook for Homo Sapiens* and *Phoenix* and the works for which Bernard Shaw, Douglas Reed, Streit and others including Lenin and Dr. Sun Yat Sen and Emil Ludwig and Samuel Butler in *Erewhon* have made themselves responsible in recent years, are notable contributions to this topic. Quite recently, the Sankey Declaration, the Atlantic Charter and the Resolutions passed at the International Conferences that have taken place during the last few months testify to the ever-present yearnings of the human soul and the human intellect and their unceasing endeavour to devise some form of society, some form of polity, some form of constitution under which humanity may best fulfil its destiny. This impulse is unquenchable and one is reminded of the familiar lines of the great Sufi poet, Omar Khayyam, whose *Rubaiyat* was translated into English verse which is accounted by some to be more expressive than the language of the original.

Ah Love! could thou and I with Fate conspire
To grasp this sorry Scheme of Things entire;
Would not we shatter it to bits—and then
Re-mould it nearer to the Heart's Desire?

Such re-moulding of the world to the heart's desire has been an age-long attempt of mankind and so, there have come into being ideal commonwealths, imaginary constitutions, and the continual picturing and envisaging of society as it is and as it should be.

Few will however deny that whatever may have been the urgency of the problem in the past, its importance today is of a different and more critical character. To use a very over-worked and hackneyed expression, we are literally at the cross-roads, one way pointing to the disintegration of most human values and the other way pointing, we trust, to a rehabilitation of authentic ideals and to a renaissance of the human spirit.

In this connection and as prefatory to my remarks, I may place before you what a fine artist, poet and thinker, Herbert Read, has observed regarding the currents and cross-currents of present day life. In a book with the very suggestive and deliberately arresting title of '*The Politics of the Unpolitical*', he declares:

'The world is waiting for a new faith—especially, the youth of the world is waiting for a new faith. The old institutions, the old parties, are dead at the roots. Young men and women stand apart, indifferent, inactive. But do not let us mistake their indifference for apathy, their inactivity for laziness. Intellectually, they are very wide awake. But they have rejected our abstract slogans and the hollow institutions in which old men gibber about freedom, democracy and culture. They don't want freedom if it means the freedom to exploit their fellowmen; they don't want democracy if it means the ridiculous bagmen of Westminster; they don't want culture if it means the intellectual dope of our academies and universities. They want to get rid

of the profiteers and the advertising men, the petty tyrannical bureaucrats and the screaming journalists, the club men and the still too numerous flock of rentiers for ever cackling over their threatened nest-eggs. They want a world that is morally clean and socially just, naturally productive and aesthetically beautiful. And they know they won't get it from any of the existing parties, from any of the existing political systems. They hate fascism, they recoil from communism, and they despise democracy. They are groping towards a new faith, a new order, a new world.'

This attitude, I believe, correctly represents the outlook of an increasingly numerous group of people who are profoundly dissatisfied with what the world has made of its institutions, with the grossly imperfect success that has attended the efforts to evolve a tolerable way of life, efforts whose only sequel has been to unleash the most primitively savage traits implicit in man. To achieve the end in view our programme has to be many-sided and our work essayed in no dogmatic or intolerant spirit.

I hold it to be our first and fundamental duty in any planning for the future that we must specially cultivate some faculties or qualities. The first requisite must needs be humility. We should, each one and all of us, recognize what a wreck we have made of the world as we found it, when we could, by well directed effort, have improved it or at least arrested the 'facilis descensus Averni' (The descent to Avernus is easy). Speaking to an audience largely composed of my own countrymen, I shall not be misunderstood when I say that this humility is not in the least needed amongst us, Indians. We have been too apt to excuse our shortcomings in the scientific and practical world as well as in the arts of politics and economic planning and to exculpate ourselves for our ill-success in the commercial and industrial spheres, by declaring: 'We have failed because we

are spiritual and because we are concentrating on the unseen forces of the Universe.' I would that it were so, but can you and I, placing our hands on our hearts, say that we are more spiritual than those men, who, not solely for the sake of their religious faith but often for the sake of science or for the sake of their country, are recklessly throwing aside their life and all that they hold dear in order to achieve the ideal which they cherish? Are we more spiritual than Father Damien who risked certain infection from leprosy in order that he might succour the lepers? Are we essentially more spiritual than the medical and scientific pioneers and the martyrs and the humanitarian leaders of the West, who do not proclaim their spirituality? Must spirituality co-exist with passivity or apathy or inertia? Should we forget the Gita wherein Lord Krishna asserts—

'Efficiency in action is true Yoga'? Let us be done with this talk of spirituality being our peculiar prerogative. I grant that at one time we led the world in many things that mattered, in philosophy, in daring and lofty speculation, in tolerance and in the things that were more excellent. We led the world and, if we are faithful to our past, we shall lead the world again, but not until we are conscious of our shortcomings and we are truly humble in spirit and recover a true sense of human values. The recent German doctrine of the *Herren Volk* and the Japanese cult of the *chosen race* are but variants of such suicidal lack of perspective.

The next essential appears to me to be the realization of the interdependence of the world in its present stage of evolution. We talk, politically and otherwise, of independence. We talk of nationalism. The days of independence, in the sense of the assertive segregation of each national or local unit and its liberty to fashion its society and its future without any reference to the rest of the world, are dead. How can England be

independent any longer? Everybody realizes that it is impossible even for the British Empire to be independent in the sense in which England could be independent thirty or forty years ago. England is and must be dependent, not only during this War but for all the post-war work, for her finance, for her economic and social reconstruction, not merely on her Dominions and possessions but at least as much on America, Russia, China and South America. Space and time have been conquered by Science and in the wake of this conquest has come the inevitable elimination of all possible isolation of human activities. And thus, the once vaunted independence of any one country in the sense in which the word independence was understood in the past has ceased to count. To say so is not to assert that political self-determination or self-government is either obsolete or the less an objective. In so far as self-government, political, economic or social, enables us to speak with our own voice, to put forward our own spontaneous and regimented efforts without domination by outside influences, its achievement has to be striven for. When the self-government of India is attained, she will and must work with England first and then with the rest of the world as an equal partner and not as a cringing servitor, or exploitable dependent. In other words, independence in the shaping and implementing of our political and economic future having been secured, the next step will be a conscious move towards inter-dependence. This is a cardinal factor in the present world-situation and the impact of this new thought has not yet come home to most of us. It is a difficult idea to grasp and carry out, but, unless we perform this duty, there is no future for us.

It need hardly be stressed that we are not the only sinners in this direction and that practically every nation has been making the same mistake. I spoke to you about India. Let us turn to England. In 1885 when

dealing with the 'laissez faire' economics of those days, the London *Times* stated as follows: 'If Great Britain has turned itself into a coal-shed and blacksmith's forge, it is for the benefit of mankind and its own.'

Cecil Rhodes, a few years later, unhesitatingly said: 'We are the first race in the world and the more of the world we inhabit, the better will it be for the human race.'

W. T. Stead, a very progressive man, in the *Review of Reviews,* in the year 1890, said: 'The English speaking race is one of God's chosen agents for improving the lot of mankind.'

Balfour in 1917, in a speech in New York, spoke of the War of 1914 as having been in aid of the 'spiritual advantage of mankind', 'without a petty thought or emotion.'

President MacKinley is reported to have averred that, before he annexed the Philippines, he prayed for guidance. He presumably got it. A high prelate at the height of the Abyssinian crisis was able to preach: 'We are animated by high moral and spiritual considerations.'

Not many weeks ago, a prominent American statesman delivered himself of the following observation:

'We must export capital both through private channels and through government. It must be agreed that money lent by the United States must be spent for purchases within the United States.' Of the Chinese, he said: 'they are my choice for the leadership of Asia. There is every reason why we should co-operate with China. She can buy, she is friendly.' 'Our compelling interests in the Pacific make friendly and close relationship with China economically and in every respect essential.'

Fortunately, on the other hand, wiser thinkers of the United States have noted the lop-sidedness of that kind of philosophy. President Roosevelt, speaking

some time ago, stated as follows in unequivocal terms, and all the more appealingly because he was confronted with very difficult local problems. 'Racial strife renders us suspect abroad.' 'Men of all races,' said he, 'black, white, brown and yellow, fight beside us for freedom. We cannot stand before the world as champions of the oppressed peoples unless we practise as well as preach the principles of democracy for all men.'

I have enumerated these instances to show that, just as we in India have so often been self-centred and short-sightedly arrogant, and as we have brooded on our past until we forgot the present and ignored the necessary watchwords of the future, so, likewise, other nations have been guilty of similar lapses. Humanity's steps are still very faltering.

What does all this reasoning lead to? It leads, without possibility of contradiction, to the definite conclusion that internationally and nationally we cannot return to the pre-war world of 1919 or 1939. On some points all instructed thinking is now practically at one. The restriction to a large and increasing extent of industrial or other profits is a thing on which the world is reluctantly being forced to agree. There was a time when it was taken for granted that the more money a few men in a country made, the better it would be not only for that country but for the whole world. The underdog, the lowly and the oppressed in each community, did not matter then, as they are beginning to matter now. Continued suppression of some national elements, and the ignoring of the economic disequilibrium of society are becoming difficult and will soon become impossible, especially after the object-lesson furnished by the U.S.S.R. and the triumphant organization of all the strata of the population of Russia for peace as well as for war. It may be taken as a definite article of faith for the future that the profit-motive in human enterprise must be definitely checked. In other

words and treating the problem comprehensively employment of the bulk of the population is coming to be regarded as more important than profit. It is much more important for the world that in each tract, as many as possible are employed usefully than that a few people should make great profits. As a corollary it follows that social stability is more important than a geometrical progression in consumption. In various newspaper articles, and in speeches by statesmen, we read of the raising of the standards of living and of the increased consumption that will follow the War, but if that increased consumption should lead directly or indirectly to social instability, the future will be gloomier than the past. Equitable distribution would, in the future, become more necessary and important than even increased production and the increase of aggregate consumption. Varying our language and quoting from a well-known economist, we find there should be, if planning for the future is to be fruitful and effective, "a sincere realisation of the subordination of economic benefits to social ends, the recognition that what is economically good is not always ultimately good." These principles may sound like platitudes but are the foundations of our plans.

There is a school of thought which takes the view that, as soon as the War is over, everything will revert to the *status quo ante*. Any one who thinks about the problem with some care will discover that it is not and cannot be so. Let us first concentrate attention on the local food problem with which we are confronted today and which Mr. Dixon* and myself, under the inspiration and stimulus of our respective Sovereigns, have been trying to solve in a fraternal spirit. Such a spirit of co-operation, I feel absolutely certain, will animate Sir George Boag† also and I pray that, with the active aid

* Mr. Dixon was then Dewan of Cochin.

† Sir George Boag is Mr. Dixon's successor as Dewan of Cochin.

of the Resident and the authorities in Delhi, it will enable us to grapple with the situation in the two States. The new Viceroy, Lord Wavell, is dealing with the situation vigorously and comprehensively and we may legitimately hope for an easing of the position. But we are not out of the woods. How often have I not heard it said by hasty writers and speakers: our crisis will last only for a year or two; when Burma is retaken everything will be all right? Is it going so soon to be all right? As I observed at a meeting yesterday, the facts are more complex than that. Who cultivated the paddy fields of Burma? Are the cultivators residing in Burma today, or are they the refugees from Burma? Have we not got to re-settle those refugees even after Burma is conquered? Great material damage has been done to houses and granaries and implements and cattle. Boat after boat has been bombed out of existence and port after port has been reduced to cinders. Burma may regain her position as exporter of rice but even then, will she necessarily send the rice to India? May a self-governing Burma not prefer China or some other country? In any case, it will take years before the *status quo* is completely restored and therefore the problem of post-war reconstruction, even from the point of view of paddy and rice, is not a short-term affair. For some months or years after the War, the needs of the situation will be as acute as during the fight. The question of matching production to consumption will persist. The period will be lengthened by the inevitable absorption of resources in material and men, in re-building and re-creating ruined towns and industries and public works. A post-war boom is most likely. The war profiteer, the war contractor, will continue to be in evidence even after the War is brought to a triumphant conclusion by the Allies who are already on the way to complete victory, though that victory may not arrive tomorrow or the day after. Indeed, I fancy that

immediately after the War there will be a kind of spurt because all the devastated countries must be renovated, all the roads, bridges and factories must be re-constructed, all the machinery must be re-fashioned and there is bound to be great activity, but all this may well give rise to an aftermath of slump unless we take care of the future from now. After perhaps a short respite, expansion of production and consumption on wise and constructive lines will have to be organised. Most people who have thought over this problem have come to the conclusion that such a result can only be achieved if humanity is wise enough to bring into existence an International society, whether it be called a League of Nations or by some other name, and some definite programme of International activity and International conjoint effort is necessary for post-war re-construction. The issue, it has been well said, will in the long run not be either constitutional or even economic. It will resolve itself into a moral problem. Professor Carr has declared: "Such an International organisation must be viewed as based on an imperative moral purpose, namely, to view and deal with the standards of life not only within the boundaries of one's own national unit but beyond them."

There is another aspect to be considered. We are too apt, in dealing with the future, to speak in negative terms. We talk of eliminating violence, of the abolition or prevention of war, reduction of armaments, removal of trade barriers, and cure of unemployment. The destruction of Nazidom and even the creation of Securities and the Rooseveltian Freedoms are essentially negative conceptions. Professor Carr has, in my opinion, taken the correct line when he emphasises that what we do want today is not a concatenation of so many negatives but some positive programme. Summarising his views, we may postulate our programme thus. The prevention of war cannot be achieved unless a New Order is

created and armaments reduced or abolished at least partially. We can only reduce armaments by bringing about a common pool of armaments for a common purpose. We may have to think of the possibility of making the air free for everybody so that no one can wreck great centres of life, religion, industry or education. Unless, therefore, in addition to talking vaguely of reduction of armaments, the world is wise enough to bring about a common pool of armaments for the purpose of preventing individual or group aggression, the problem will not be solved. To remove trade barriers, we cannot afford to proceed academically as the League of Nations did. They appointed Committees by the score for this purpose, but they did not bring about a growth in International trade. The removal of trade barriers can only be brought about by the positive creation, stimulus and encouragement of International commerce and the ruthless eradication of needless and irritating barriers. To cure unemployment we must organise men for pooling their resources with a view to effect urgent and necessary social reforms on the lines attempted by Sir William Beveridge and others.

Put in a nut-shell, "We shall fail if we merely entrench ourselves to protect what we possess or what we possessed in the past. A positive and constructive programme is the first condition of any effective moral purpose". These having been stated to be our main objectives, what are the ideas that will be our lodestars and what will our instruments be for navigation on these unchartered seas? One of the most illuminating contributions to the fashioning of a post-war order is by Mr. H. G. Wells, who, notwithstanding certain angularities and some over-emphasis, continues to be as clear-sighted and crystalline in thought as when he predicted this War about twenty years ago in company with writers like Douglas Reed and Norman Angell. Mr. Wells has laid down three imperatives. He has said

that the first imperative which the world is bound to follow, is the establishment of 'an over-riding federal control of transport and inter-state communications throughout the world.' Let us mark the words. I was present at a meeting of the sub-committee of the League of Nations when a Czecho-Slovakian representative brought in a package and put it on the table of the committee. That package had more than a dozen different customs stamps imprinted on it. There were so many trade barriers, economic barriers, which that package had to pass through, before it became available to the consignee. At every one of those places, harassing restrictions, inquisitorial proceedings and bureaucratic interference had to be surmounted. Particularism, exaggerated nationalism and short-sighted economics were the root cause of this sorry business. The second of Mr. Wells' imperatives is the federal conservation of world-resources. It should not be possible, hereafter, to think of starving one race to make another race prosperous; nor should it be possible for Brazil to burn its coffee or for another country to destroy its wheat or maize, whilst other parts of the world are starving. And the third imperative of Mr. Wells is that there must be a fundamental set of laws which all the nations of the world will have to obey as basic or universal.

Now, let us turn to India. What shall be the main tasks for the India of the future? The first imperative —I am quoting Wells' expression—is to take away the mind of the people from exclusive preoccupation with political and communal matters. That can only be brought about by a speedy compromise by which the political man will feel that his energies can peacefully and with self-respect be transformed and transmuted so that, as soon as possible, India may concentrate her attention and her gifts upon what is much more needed by us than anything else, namely, social and economic

equality with the rest of the world. Politics cannot be eliminated from its place of honour on our programmes until and unless the need and excuse for agitation disappear and India achieves equality with England and a consequent sense of equanimity and self-respect. But this can only be the first step. Unless our engineers, our research students, our economists, our practical agriculturists and industrialists make us as economically and scientifically effective as England or America, England and America will look down and rightly look down upon us. We cannot continue to be the poor relation of the West. We are not at present concentrating on the main tasks that are incumbent on us. We are for various reasons concentrating on the winning of power and rights from England and on attaining the ideal of independence or dominion-status, both of which formulae connote essential equality with England. Assume that India becomes independent tomorrow in the narrower sense, even then she may be economically dependent on America or England. This vassalage will be at least as burdensome as political vassalage. Let us look at the plight of the ordinary man at the end of the Harding or Coolidge period in the United States, when political enfranchisement had been achieved. The economic inequality and the real serfdom that existed in America, the many difficulties which the ordinary man had to fight against or succumb to, such as the trusts, the pools and the syndicates and the other iniquitous combinations of rich and unscrupulous men who were out to exploit the poor and lowly, all these were features of a type of modern slavery which, in essence, transcended, in its cruelty and certainly in its impersonal indifference to individual feelings and welfare, the worst slavery of the past.

In order to enable India to work out her destiny, a political compromise is essential. But that political compromise and the necessary agreement with the

British will be entered into with this definite idea, namely, that it is not an end in itself. It is just the first step in order to arrive at economic equality and sufficiency, such sufficiency and economic equality being translated in terms of adequate economic opportunity and encouragement to every class and group in this country.

Nextly, a demarcation should be effected between economic and industrial and educational planning and the controversies of politics. Too often and wholly unnecessarily we are dealing with our educational reorganisation in terms of politics and parties and communities. Industry is dealt with in the same manner. If community A has a Chamber of Commerce, community B must also have a Chamber of Commerce although commercial questions have no creed nor caste. If community X has a trade association, community Y must also have another trade association. X and Y are both undeveloped in the real sense but the fact of having two associations is regarded as an end in itself.

This War and, especially, the repercussions of our food problem, must have brought home to us (and I trust that the lesson has been learnt well enough and imprinted deeply enough in our minds not to be obliterated quickly), the necessity for the proper type of centralization and prevention of overlapping. There must be centralization of advice on ameliorative and nation-wide programmes and centralization of research and statistics. There must be central direction of general policy, in respect of procurement and distribution of food, machinery, appliances and material and also to ensure the prevention of overlapping activities. If Travancore can specialise in copra and coir and Bengal can do something with jute, why should Bengal try to manufacture coir and why should we start a hazardous experiment by cultivating jute? In our University life, scholastic life, and economic life, wher-

ever we turn, we find the reduplication of energies. The same kind of factory is started in most Provinces and States, although a single factory is capable of doing fine work in one place and there is not room for two. When the War is over and when not only the victor nations but even Germany and Japan and Italy, after a period of strict probation, begin to compete in industry and trade as they certainly will, we shall perhaps come back to a stage, when what happened some years ago in England may recur in other countries also. It was mentioned to me, that, while celebrating the Empire Day in Birmingham in a particular year, they found that many of the flags used for decoration were made in Japan.

Our position is perfectly clear. We are too poor, not sufficiently full of organised resources, not sufficiently full of well-directed and scientifically regimented energy to waste our efforts in reduplication and needless multiplication. Why should there be fifteen Universities in India, all teaching the same subjects and in the same way and following practically the same curricula leading to the same calamitous result of discontented unemployment? Why should not each devote itself to some specific work of research or study that is best for itself and in tune with its surroundings? Whether in industry, trade, education or economics, we should in sheer self-defence start, betimes, to pool our resources together and avoid repetitive effort. Above all, in matters of All-India importance like the procurement and supply of food, there can be no room for piecemeal programmes; local interests and idiosyncrasies and fads and selfishness have to yield place to a continental consciousness. I shall give an instance which I have referred to more than once, but it bears repetition. Travancore and Cochin are starving or semi-starving, although fortunately and by reason of the painful tightening of our belts in unison, we have

no corpses littering our streets. Out of the abundance of their generous heart, the Government of India came to our rescue. We are very deeply grateful to them. But just picture the state of things at the present moment. In their solicitude, the Government of India say to Travancore and Cochin that they have a thousand tons of rice to spare in Kashmir and that they propose sending that rice to Cochin. One would have thought that an alternative process was possible, namely that Kashmir may send its surplus to the United Provinces, the United Provinces may send its surplus to the Central Provinces, the Central Provinces may send the surplus to Madras and Madras conceivably—and here I speak with bated breath in the presence of one* who was till recently the Senior Adviser to the Madras Government—can give out of its abundance to Travancore and Cochin! But no; we are getting rice from Kashmir all the way round. This is only one of many examples. I am apprehensive that, in future, such instances may be multiplied unless there is a vivid consciousness, not only on the part of those at the helm of affairs but of the man in the street and of the man in the field, that India must act as one entity, speak with one voice, shall think with one mind and be dealt with as one economic unit and as one personality, and that Provincial needs and State needs should be rationalised and integrated for the benefit of India regarded as a whole—each unit being educated to co-operate with every other.

In order to fit ourselves for our future destiny, we should also start a vigorous campaign for the appropriate modification of our social laws and the rehabilitation of our co-operative enterprises so as to admit of large-scale industrial and agricultural pursuits. I am talking to a West-Coast audience. I cannot dogmatise on what may happen in Cochin because I am not intimately acquaint-

* Sir George Boag.

ed with conditions here but I shall talk of what takes place in Travancore, with whose conditions I am perfectly familiar. The *Marumakkatayam* system has decayed. The *Makkatayam* system has not been fully assimilated and adopted and cannot be adopted for many reasons. Partition has been made a legislative and a daily possibility. Groups of families, which were living in a patriarchally simple and harmonious manner about 50 years ago, are now divided, and fragmentation is the order of the day. What is the result? A young man takes a Degree and has probably run into debt for the purpose. He asserts his rights to his share of one-third or one-fourth of an acre at a partition. He buys a motor cycle or rather bought it in days when motor cycles were procurable outside the black-market. He invests on a few other superfluities and drives round the city or the country till the motor cycle becomes derelict and his superfluities vanish in the course of his search for an elusive job. He then subsides into a lethargic hand-to-mouth existence. This kind of thing will not do. Scientific and large-scale farming and intensive production are becoming well-nigh impossible. There is no scope for trade or industry on even a modest scale. No progress is possible without the consolidation of resources, of family resources to start with, and then of regional resources through co-operative enterprise. I have been talking of the pooling of national and international resources. But they are impossible of fulfilment unless the family resources and local resources are made fully available. My plea is that, unless there is a speedy and wide-spread rehabilitation of the co-operative movement, of which unfortunately I do not see any definite signs, there should be carefully devised social legislation —designed to discourage fragmentation and partition and to encourage consolidation of holdings, whether it is done on the lines of the Punjab Land Consolidation Act or otherwise. We are talking of scarcity of food in

Cochin or in Travancore. How can that scarcity be combated? It should theoretically be dealt with by the increase of arable areas. But there is no area to be increased. One method that is suggested for increasing production is by the denudation of the forests, but this will affect our rainfall and will make it very difficult for us to embark on those industrial schemes which are dependent on the timber resources of these two States. If, therefore, we cannot extend our arable area, we must at least intensify cultivation. How are we going to intensify cultivation so as to approach Italy which produces five times as much for every acre of rice as Travancore or Cochin, or to approach Japan which produces six or seven times as much for every acre? They achieve their results by careful scientific supervision, careful manuring, skilful and up-to-date methods applied to the cultivation of the soil. How shall *we* be able to do anything of this kind with scattered and minute holdings, the owners being as scattered as the lands themselves? We have made a humble beginning in Travancore. An agricultural income-tax has been imposed and, as part of our income-tax legislation, we have enacted that those who consolidate their holdings will get some concession but those who partition their lands will have to pay progressively higher rates. We hope to achieve some positive results in this direction, but that may take some time. This is not a matter appertaining to one State or one corner of India. It is a matter of All-India importance. Modern agriculture needs extension of areas, where possible, and everywhere the enlargement of holdings and careful scientific treatment of the soil in addition to the utilisation of Electric power both for agriculture and the allied industries. They are now attempting with success in America and elsewhere to grow vegetables without any soil, namely, by means of chemical solutions. They are trying to increase the growth not only of the existing crops on land but to

introduce new and vigorous species.

It therefore behoves us to consider a re-orientation of our social and legislative activities so as to bring into being large-scale farming and allied industries. Closely allied are the problems of irrigation, of reclamations of land in suitable localities, of drainage and pumping and of avoidance of soil-erosion. How much is lost in Cochin and Travancore by this erosion on account of the foolish forest fires and the cultivation on the present lines? We have to initiate an India-wide campaign in favour of prevention of erosion, with which we should combine propaganda for terraced cultivation and experiments with new varieties of rice and other cereals and soya bean and other crops in order that we may produce adequate quantities of food-stuffs. We cannot continue always to look for help from outside, and I, for one, resent monetary help at this juncture from outside. I have, for instance, declined on behalf of the Travancore Government to accept any subscription from outside Travancore for the relief of the distressed in Travancore. Let the Bengal millionaire and the Bengal ministry decide for themselves whether it is necessary in an already rich country like Bengal to bring more money into it by public subscriptions and thereby perhaps to augment the inflationary processes by raising the price of commodities and ultimately hitting the cultivator and the poor man.

But we, at the same time, ask for and shall welcome help in the matter of food-grains from everywhere, in the matter of milk and milk products from everywhere. We have come back to a primitive state of society when we want everything in kind and not in the shape of the modern substitute, namely, money.

But all such gratuitous help from outside is a hindrance rather than a help in the long run. Nothing that is not earned will serve our purpose.

There are other great problems arising out of the

need to pool our resources. What is it that has been done in this country for heavy industry, shipping, marine and air transport, to equal what Russia has been able to achieve in 15 or 20 years? Every river is connected with practically every other great river by canals so that water-borne traffic which is much cheaper than rail-road traffic is utilised to the full in the U.S.S.R. But what have *we* done? Many years ago, Madras contemplated the linking up of Tungabadra, Krishna and Godavari rivers. During my membership, of the Madras Executive Council, when Sir George Boag was also a fellow worker with me, I revived that scheme; but the scheme is now practically where it was. A modernised and revised planning for the purpose of utilising and linking up all sources of hydro-electricity, the swift improvement of road and canal and coastal communications, and the utilisation of every possible mineral, agricultural and industrial asset of India to the best advantage have to be our first priorities. The spacing out and proper allocation of industrial centres so as not to create slums or over-crowding ought to be attempted. A comprehensive and speedy implementing of major industrial schemes is an urgent necessity. In five years Canada and Australia have become highly industrialised regions and their factories and ship-building yards have done in a few years what India has not even attempted in half a century, notwithstanding that the people of India have proved themselves to be not wanting in scientific aptitude and mechanical skill. What is also needed is a complete re-shaping of scholastic and University education. I am not an opponent of the humanities. I am fully aware of the magnificent heritage which has come down to us, a heritage of great poetry, of profound philosophy, of daring speculation and of easy flights in those empyrean regions which the Indian mind has made almost its exclusive domain. But new times demand new solutions and methods. New solutions

demand changes in the theory and practice of education. Let our education be so re-ordered that in every school the young boys and girls learn to take care of and to keep strong and supple his or her body. We have too closely cultivated the emotional and speculative sides of our nature as distinct from the physical side. That is the first duty of the educationist. The next duty is to make our education more and more vocational so that every young man might have some trade or industry to fall back upon when his book-learning fails him. This is a problem which necessitates the reconciliation of competing interests, educational and economic. Commercial supremacy, industrial growth and initiative in manufacture will only come with a new approach to the training of our youths. But whatever we do, let us avoid some likely perils in the planning of the future. Let us avoid the rise of that variety of capitalism, selfish, exorbitant and octopus-like, which has come into being in some countries of the West. That capitalism is the slave-driver of today. If India, in the past, had made one contribution to the thought and life of the world, it is the enforcement of the idea that worldly wealth counts for little as against the things that are more excellent, the things of the intellect and spirit. In this planning, we ask for no special favours but we demand and should work for International equity. International Justice, Peace and Goodwill are possible only when there is a minimum of national well-being. The standards of life in the world have to be equalised and raised considerably before real peace can be confidently predicted.

In this process, necessarily painful, necessarily laborious, that we have to undertake by way of planning for a happier future for India and incidentally and necessarily for a happier future for the Commonwealth and humanity as a whole, we should avoid some besetting dangers. Aldous Huxley speaks of the perils of humanity as comprised within three categories of idolatry.

The first he calls *technological idolatry*, whose devotees believe that redemption of the human soul and mind depends upon machines and gadgets. That is a kind of idolatry to which the Indian mind is not naturally prone but the coming struggle for existence may easily predispose us to that species of idolatry. Next in order is *political idolatry* where the worship of particular social or economic organisations may be regarded as an end in itself, people forgetting that organisations, and Constitutions—Republican, Democratic or whatever else we call them—mean nothing unless the people put their souls as well as their minds into them. I shall only instance some South American Republics as examples of Republics which have not evinced markedly republican qualities. Many really totalitarian regimes even now call themselves republics and he who runs may read the signs of the times. The last idolatry which is perhaps the most insidious and dangerous, is what has been styled *moral idolatry*. That idolatry is the setting up of some scheme, some idea, some slogan, which is personally to our taste or squares with our inclinations as the be-all and end-all of existence. This idolatry tends to hardness, intolerance, fanaticism and spiritual pride, and this is a danger to which we are specially subject and which has sedulously to be avoided. May it be given to us to eschew such idolatries and to create for ourselves a future which will be commensurate with our past and which can assuredly be realised if we work with a will and in unison!

4. THE FEDERAL IDEA*

A few months ago, in the course of my professional duties, the task devolved on me of investigating certain aspects of the problem of federation in connection with the future of Indian States. It then struck me that the topic will repay careful study, both from the historical and the practical points of view. Some of the results of such study have been embodied in the address which I now have the privilege of delivering to you, and it is to me a source of intense gratification that the occasion is associated with the Jubilee Celebrations of a Ruler, who, by his progressive methods of administration and his adherence to sound constitutional principles, is, in his own person, one of the strongest arguments in favour of such a federation of self-governing political entities as is now envisaged by the majority of Indian thinkers.

It is a very trite saying and true, that there is nothing new under the sun, and this adage is especially illustrated in philosophy and politics. Let me give an illustration which will demonstrate that the teachings of history are never obsolete. Those of us who have had an experience of Diarchy, if we may profitably turn to Roman History, will discover that almost exactly in the places where our shoes pinch us today, was the pain felt in the Rome of the Augustan Age. It may not be well-known that Diarchy was the name assigned by the celebrated historian, Mommsen, to the system introduced by Augustus—a constitution wherein the Emperor and his own officers, while really exercising all the powers of Government, hid their omnipotence by bestowing on the Senate certain apparently important functions and taking away from that body, at the same time,

* Sri Krishna Rajendra Silver Jubilee University Lecture delivered at Mysore on 8th August, 1928.

its ancient control of finance and the direction of foreign policy. As Gibbon, amongst others, has pointed out, the Augustan Diarchy was a division of executive functions and not of power, and to the curious, the following sentence from Gibbon will read like an extract from some daily newspaper. "The principles of a true constitution are irrevocably lost when the legislative power is nominated by the executive." The Roman method of solving the problem of Diarchy was direct and summary and led to the establishment of a unitary government, which soon outlived its usefulness and toppled over by its own weight.

Whatever the systems of internal government were, and whether they were city states, monarchies, oligarchies or republics, attempts have been and were made in the ancient and modern world to form federations for general or limited purposes, and it will be my object rapidly to pass in review as many as possible of these attempts at federal government, to analyse their essential characteristics and to deduce therefrom such lessons as may be useful for us today. As the poet sings, each age is a dream that is dying or one that is coming to birth; and I think it can be stated without fear of contradiction that among the lessons of the Great War may be classed the realisation of the necessity for the grouping of States and the consciousness that political federations and a League of Nations furnish the best protection in the case of States and nations who have till recently been the victims either of a war of armaments or a trade war. This is one of the manifestations of the Time Spirit, and, at this juncture, we may well keep in mind what Morley once declared in regard to Cobden and his times. "Great economic and social forces," said Morley, "flow with a tidal sweep over communities that are only half conscious of that which is befalling them. Wise Statesmen are those who foresee what time is thus bringing and endeavour to shape institutions and

to mould men's thoughts and purposes in accordance with the change that is silently surrounding them." In such an endeavour, we shall get instruction and apposite illustration from many quarters, in the *Vedas* and the *Itihasas* and Kautilya, in Aristotle and Machiavelli, not to mention later thinkers and legislators who have built securely on old foundations. This study, as I have already stated, is much more than merely academic; for, we cannot forget the relevance and the importance of the federal idea at the present moment. The authors of the Montagu-Chelmsford Report, whatever the value of the particular scheme evolved by them was, have had before them, it must be acknowledged with gratitude, a true vision of the India of the future. What do they say? "Our conception of the eventual future of India is a sisterhood of States self-governing in all matters of purely local or provincial interests, in some cases corresponding to existing provinces, in others, perhaps modified in area according to the character and economic interests of their people. Over these congeries of States would preside a central government increasingly representative of, and responsible to, the people, dealing with matters, both internal and external, of common interest to the whole of India; acting as arbiter in inter-State relations and representing the interests of all India on equal terms with the self-governing units of the British Empire." They add in words which will no doubt be familiar to this audience: "In this picture there is a place for the Native States. It is possible that they too will wish to be associated for certain purposes with the organisation of British India in such a way as to dedicate their peculiar qualities to the common service without loss of individuality." Mr. Montagu and Lord Chelmsford must be classed among the wise statesmen whom Morley has referred to as those who foresee what time is bringing. In this passage, there is found the germ of all the leafage and the fruitage of Indian politics

—provincial autonomy, linguistic provinces, a strong central government, a federation of various political units and an exposition of the limits of their jurisdiction, (such units including the Indian States) and the constitution of a commonwealth equal in status and similar in function to the self-governing Dominions.

I shall now discuss the growth of the ideal which has found expression in the above passage. A federal union was often attempted in old times by Sovereign States for mutual aid and the promotion of common interests, and if the Achaean and other Greek Confederacies, which were formed after the death of Alexander, had been formed earlier, Hellenic culture and Grecian freedom may perchance have been preserved.

The two Leagues of which we hear most in Greek History are the Aetolian and the Achaean. The former was a league of districts rather than of cities, and it had many points of similarity with the Swiss Confederacy of city and forest cantons. The Achaean League, on the other hand, was composed of cities, and it flourished for over a couple of centuries. The Achaeans destroyed their monarchy and set up a Federal Republic, ten of the twelve cities composing their league, being situated on the Corinthean Gulf. The historian, Polybius, tells us that this league was admired for its fairness and equity and was taken as a model by the cities of greater Greece in the early part of the 6th century, when the lingering consciousness of Hellenic unity and the influence of a common danger obliterated the separatist tendencies always so rife in Greece and brought about a certain amount of consolidation and union in action.

Sparta was the head of a purely voluntary confederacy in the 5th and 4th centuries B.C., the members of which for some time, at all events, regarded their interests as bound up in hers. In contrast, Athens was the mistress of an empire. The contrast in the political developments of Athens and Sparta was similar to the

contrast displayed in the political growth respectively of the United States and Great Britain.

It is not my object further to discuss the history of these leagues, but speaking of such federations as well as of the Swiss, Machiavelli, than whom there has been no shrewder judge of men nor keener analyst of affairs, observed in 1513, that "federal States cannot easily expand but hold firmly to what they have acquired and do not lightly embark on war, since a republic thus divided cannot make quick decisions. Ambition, moreover, is less set to expansion when its fruits have to be shared," and he further remarks that "the number of fourteen States in the Swiss Confederation has never been increased." It will be noticed that this great political thinker has perceived both the merit and the demerit of federations, their slowness in executive decisions as well as their general pacific disposition. Speaking of various political methods, he gives utterance to an idea which is the nucleus of all modern thought on the subject. "This way is still the best," he says, "namely, to win partners, not subjects."

The controversy amongst ancient and medieval writers regarding federations, their value and their demerits, was renewed in a very startling manner when certain State Premiers in Australia claimed to be admitted to the Imperial Conference along with the Federal Premier on the ground that under the Australian Commonwealth Act the residue of sovereignty was in the States. In the course of that discussion, Deakin, the well-known Australian Premier, reiterated what the Greeks and the Italians had stated centuries ago, namely, that there are two absolute and essential requisites of a federal system: (1) equality of status and (2) direct relation of citizen to citizen under the federal Government, irrespective of the State Governments. He thus emphasised the two distinct, though not incompatible, elements of a federation, namely, autonomy of the indi-

vidual States and the co-existence therewith of loyalty to the central federation. The second essential often tends to be absent in Imperial partnership because of the absence of a supreme federal authority.

In Sir Richard Jebb's book on the Imperial Conference, this proposition is strongly emphasised, and the argument adduced is that it is necessary to maintain in full strength the central organisation. This, it will be remembered, was attempted in the case of the War Cabinet, and further steps are now being contemplated in the same direction.

Turning to the history of India in the Vedic and post-Vedic times, we perceive that monarchy is described in the *Rig Veda* as the normal form of Government, but Greek writers from Megasthenes onwards have informed us that many centuries before the Christian era, various republican experiments were tried in India. Some of these experiments have been described in the well-known work of Professor Jayaswal on Hindu Polity. We have been given a description of the democracy of the Ambashtas who had a Second House composed of elected elders, of other tribes who instead of sending ambassadors, sent 100 or 150 representatives to negotiate a treaty of peace, and of the Patalas, where the Council of Elders ruled, the ultimate political authority resting with the *Gana* or *Sangha*, *i.e.*, the tribal assembly. Whilst on this topic, it may be noticed that the *Mahabharata* speaks of the troubles of the *Gana* constitution arising from the difficulty of keeping resolutions secret, and of the consequent necessity of vesting matters of policy in the hands of a few *Mantradharas*. Much later than these republics, which were described by Diodorus and the well-known Arrian, arose the Imperial systems, such systems developing along the two familiar lines of imperial suzerainty and of federation. The former was described by such expressions as *Maharajya* and *Adhipatya*, and the latter was spoken of as *Sarvabhauma* or

Samrajya. The *Samrajya* is very frequently adverted to in Vedic and post-Vedic literature, and mention is made of it in the *Aitareya Brahmana*. Literally translated, it means, of course, a collection of States under one super-State. The *Brahmana* speaks of a certain ruler being consecrated as *Samrat* at Magadha. The *Sukla Yajur Veda* speaks of the *Samrat* as existing elsewhere also. In the *Sabha Parva*, Ch. 19, we get an account of the Rishi, Chanda Kausika, meeting Brihatratha and greeting his son as a future *Samrat*. He says: "All the kings of the earth will be in obedience to the commands of this child, like every creature endued with body living dependent upon *Vayu* that is dear as self unto beings." The son so blessed was Jarasandha. Elsewhere in the *Mahabharata*, *i.e.*, in the *Adi Parva*, it is narrated that the position of the *Samrat*, namely, that of the chief of the federal organisation, was acquired by Jarasandha, and Sisupala, the king of the Chedies, was constituted the common Commander-in-Chief, these appointments being founded on an inter-State contractual basis. We also learn in regard to this federation that the Kukura and the Vrishni tribes, acting on motives of policy, determined not to fight with Jarasandha but apparently made terms with him and joined his federation. One of the causes of the downfall of Jarasandha was that, having acquired his position for the purpose of common protection, he abused that position and endeavoured to reduce other sovereigns into practical slavery. In addition to Jarasandha, another *Samrat* or President of a federation is known to us,—Janaka, King of the Videhas. Videha, it will be recollected, was a small State in North-east India, and it was the outstanding personal quality of King Janaka which led to his obtaining the position of President or Chief of the federation. It was on account of its inherently democratic character that in the *Aitareya Brahmana*, the *Samrajya* is classed amongst the forms of popular

Government. Other passages in our literature also furnish indications pointing in the same direction. The elective principle of kingship, the possibility of deposition or refusal to re-elect the chief, are all discerned in the germ. In the *Atharva Veda Samhita*, Ch. 6. vs. 87-88, the following passage occurs: "Let all the people want thee; let not the kingdom fall away from thee; be not moved away like a mountain; let the gathering *Samiti* suit thee who art fixed," the *Samiti* referring to the assembly of those gathered together for the chief's election. This evidently is an invocation to the king to preserve all these qualities, which will keep him at the head of the federal system. This hymn also occurs in the *Rig Veda* and both in the *Rig* and *Atharva Vedas*, after this hymn there is another passage containing the expression of a hope that the *Samrat* will not fall from his office.

It may not be out of place to remember that in close analogy to the electoral machinery of the United States, there were certain officers of State in some Indian kingdoms who were called *Rutnins*, who gathered together and gave a symbolical authority to the *Raja* or *Samrat*. These men were also called *Rajakrit* or king-makers, and they were spoken of as sometimes degrading and banishing and sometimes re-electing, the *Samrat*. As time went on, and as the spirit of conquest became more and more prevalent, the unitary Imperial system superseded the *Samrajya* theory and the *Chakravarti* ideal became prevalent. But many Indian philosophers embodied in their writings a reaction against this *Chakravarti* system which generally went hand in hand with continuous expeditions and conquests or defeats. In the *Vishnu Purana*, for instance, the federal system has been praised by way of contrast, and it is worthy of notice that both in Manu and in the *Vishnu Purana*, the suggestion was made that that system was the best in which even after conquest individual States were not

annihilated nor dynasties destroyed.

In medieval Italy, a large number of city states came into existence, which were true self-governing communities; such communities coalesced into leagues or groups, but they were predecessors not of modern federations but of the national and regional States of recent times.

The German Federation as it existed before the French Revolution was a complex affair. Its component parts were (1) ecclesiastical electors and secular electors, including the King of Bohemia; (2) spiritual and temporal princes; and (3) Imperial cities. This federation was destroyed by Napoleon and was succeeded by the Confederation of the Rhine established in 1806 with the French Emperor as Protector. The later German Confederation was formed in 1871. Delegates from various Governments formed the Bundesrath, the popular assembly or Reichstag being directly elected. The federal body had jurisdiction over foreign affairs, the army, navy, postal services, customs, tariffs, coinage, political laws affecting citizens, commerce and navigation, passports, etc.

Switzerland was in reality the oldest, as it is perhaps the most stable, form of federative union. It now comprises 22 sovereign States, there being two federal legislative chambers, the Senate and an Assembly. The system originated as early as 1291, when three Cantons entered into a defensive league. The present constitution came into force in 1874 and included the compulsory referendum as well as the right of the people to inaugurate legislation as distinct from the right of the legislature, a right which is called popular initiative. The federal Government consisting of the two Houses and the federal executive exercise jurisdiction in matters of peace, war and treaties, army, railway, post and telegraph systems, coining money, the issue and repayment of bank notes, and weights and measures. Legis-

lation on copyright, bankruptcy, patents, sanitation, police and certain public works concerning the whole or a great part of Switzerland, are also within the federal jurisdiction. The Council of States is composed of 44 members, two for each Canton, chosen, and paid by the 22 Cantons. The National Council, or the Lower House, consists of representatives of the Swiss people chosen by direct election at the rate of one Deputy for every 20,000 souls. The executive authority is deputed to a Federal Council for three years by the Federal Assembly. The President of this very economical Republic has a salary of £1,080 per year, each member of the Federal Council getting £1,000 per year. The constitution of this country is however *sui generis* and doubts have been expressed by such competent thinkers as Viscount Bryce whether a similar system extending over wide areas and in vast populations, such as Great Britain or France, will work as well. This aspect was emphasised in a very remarkable address delivered by the great Napoleon in 1801 to the Swiss delegates. He said: "For States like yours, the federal system is eminently advantageous. I am myself a born mountaineer, and I know the spirit which inspires mountaineers. The more I reflect on the nature of your country and on the diversity of its constituent elements, the more am I convinced of the impossibility of submitting it to uniformity at the top. Everything amongst you conduces to federalism. How much difference exists between the dwellers among the mountains and the dwellers in the cities!" He added that "the Swiss resemble no other State, whether in the nature of historical events that have happened during the many centuries, or the different languages, different religions and the differences in manner that exist in different parts. Nature has made the State federal." In 1803, Napoleon wrote a letter to the Swiss Republic in which he observed: "A form of Government, which is the result of a long series of mis-

fortunes, of efforts and of enterprise on the part of the people, will not easily take root anywhere else." No doubt there are special features of the Swiss constitution, which cannot be easily reduplicated in larger countries. I am especially bearing in mind the referendum and the initiative. It is also no doubt true that the success of the experiment in that country is due to historical antecedents, to the long practice of Self-Government in small communities, to social equality and the pervading sense of public duty. But, nevertheless, it may be remembered that this federal system has brought about united effort among men belonging to different racial stocks, speaking different languages and divided not only by religion but by manners *inter se*. In his classical book on *Modern Democracies,* Viscount Bryce has drawn pointed attention to the circumstance that the federal system leads to many matters being settled by the State, provincial or cantonal assemblies, but that, at the same time, discussions and differences of opinion in the federal assemblies do not generally or necessarily coincide with local differences. Men opposed in national or federal politics often work together harmoniously in the conduct of local, country or municipal business, and this is a feature that obtains not only in Switzerland but also in England, in Canada and in the United States.

The constitution of the United States was settled on the 17th September 1787, and 19 amendments have since then been added, the 18th amendment dealing with prohibition and the 19th with women-suffrage. One of the most remarkable things about the development of the constitution in America is the marked difference in the progress of political institutions there as compared with England. In the language of President Wilson, the mode of integration in America has been federal. In English politics, it has been absorptive. Elsewhere he says: "In all countries the rule of government action is co-operation and the method of development is the

shaping of old habits into new ones and the modifying of old means to accomplish new ends. The methods, however, differ according to racial genius." An illustration of this difference is easily available even in America. The Southern colonies took a different line from the Northern, and their method of progress was on English lines to start with. But in New England, the process was federative from the first, a matter of concession and contract and voluntary association. The Union originated in the grouping together of the New England colonies against the Indians. In 1765 delegates from 9 colonies met at New York, and protested against taxation by the English Parliament, which started the revolution. In 1774 was inaugurated the first of the series of conferences in which the American Union took its rise. In the early stages, there was no trace of organic union nor an attempt to bring it about. Federal powers were exercised by the Congress through committees, which were its executive organs: but these committees were advisory, and at the start, the whole thing was more or less like an International Convention, or a meeting of the present-day League of Nations. The Confederation had no executive power as such, and the nine constituent States had to concur before any resolution was adopted and carried out. The executive agency that was created was moreover a committee of members representing all the States. In the language, again, of President Wilson, "it could ask the States for money, but could not compel them to give it; it could ask them for troops, but could not force them to heed their requisition; it could make treaties, but must trust the States to fulfil them; it could contract debts, but must rely on the States to pay them." In his expressive phrase, "It was a body richly endowed with prerogatives but not with powers." The result of this executive imperfection became very obvious when the immediate pressure of war was removed and a war of tariffs began between

neighbouring States, such as New York and New Jersey, Virginia and Maryland.

The working of the original system very soon led American statesmen to the conclusion that in order to maintain internal order and to produce inter-State peace and good will, a real and powerful central government was essential. This feeling led to the Convention of 1787, which, in turn, created the modern government of the United States. In this convention was it that the idea originated of two legislatures, not following the English system, but exemplifying a real difference of character and origin, one House representing the States equally, the other House representing the people in the aggregate proportionally. The written constitution and its character led to the judiciary being placed not under the President or the two Chambers, but on a footing of equality and alongside of them. As has been observed in an authoritative treatise on the American Constitution, written constituent law is, by its very nature, a law higher than any statute and by that constitution, as by an invariable standard, the Supreme Court should test all legislation. It is well known that although the constitution framed then has subsisted and grown from strength to strength, the originators were not very much in love with the system they produced and, in fact, they would not have produced it but for the feeling that the only alternative to complete disintegration was some kind of definite union. The fathers of the constitution were always nervous of having too potent a central government rather than of having one which was too weak. They made very elaborate provision to secure that no sacrifice of autonomy or individuality should be made by the States. As is sometimes seen in India, so in the United States, patriotism was often confounded with State patriotism, and did not always signify federal patriotism, and only idealists like Hamilton felt and spoke otherwise. This led to constant threats of secession, and it

needed the Civil War to complete the union, to make the country homogeneous and to convert the federal government into a real representative of the nation. Even now, the American Government is somewhat amorphous. The Central Government has become permanent and very strong, but the States have retained their powers and their individuality. In a passage in Woodrow Wilson's *The State,* it is asserted: "The prerogatives of the State are as essential to our system as ever, are, indeed, becoming more and more essential to it from year to year as the already complex organism of the Nation expands. But instead of regarding the Government of the United States and the Government of a State as two Governments, we are beginning to regard them as two parts of one and the same government, two complementary parts of a single system." As in Switzerland so in America, the various States have maintained their right to govern in all ordinary matters without federal interference. As De Tocqueville has emphasised, "the States are the chief constituent units of the political system. They make up the mass, the constituent tissue, the organic stuff of the government of the country." The ideal of the United States, in short, is that federal government is the exception, while the government of the State is the rule.

Following up this principle, the legislative powers of the Union are only those which it would be impossible to regulate by any system of State action. The Congress, therefore, has the power to levy and collect taxes, duties, imposts and excises, for the support of the government of the Union, the payment of its debts and the promotion of the common defence and welfare, as well as the power to borrow money on the credit of the United States. But powers of taxation and borrowing also belong to the States, though they must not raise their revenues by a resort to duties, imposts and excises, which privilege appertains to the Union exclusively.

The powers differentiating the general government from the government of the States are not really the powers of raising money but the following: control of the monetary system of the country, the maintenance of post office and postal roads, patents and copyrights, crimes on the high seas and against the law of nations, the foreign relations of the country, the control of the armed forces, the declaration of war and peace and the regulation of commerce with foreign countries and among the States. All these powers, as will be seen, are such as will affect interests which cannot be adequately regulated by separate State action. All other powers inhere in the States. There are certain further powers which the States cannot exercise; namely, passing any *expost facto* law or bill of attainder, impairing the obligation of contracts, granting any title of nobility and concluding agreements with other States or with foreign powers. These restrictions, however, hardly impair the normal sphere of action of the States. What are the powers inherent in the American States? All the civil and the religious rights depend on State legislation; education, regulation of suffrage, rules of marriage and of guardianship and parent and child, partnerships, insurance, corporations, possession, distribution and use of property, all contractual relations and all criminal law with unimportant exception are within their purview. As stated by a text writer on the subject, to detail the parts of State jurisdiction would be to catalogue all social and business relationships, and to set forth all the foundations of law and order. An illustration has often been given of the preponderant part played by State law, as contrasted with the English system consisting in the fact that practically all the subjects of legislation which engaged the public mind of England in the 19th century would have come within the purview of State legislation: Catholic emancipation, Parliamentary reform, the amendment of the Poor Laws, the reform of

municipal corporations, the admission of Jews into Parliament, the disestablishment of the Irish Church, the alteration of the Irish land laws, the establishment of national education, the introduction of the ballot and the reform of the criminal law. In fact, it has been averred that excepting the repeal of the Corn Laws and the abolition of slavery, all the main subjects with which the English Parliament busied itself during the whole of the last century would have been subjects for State regulation; and even about slavery, it was only by constitutional amendment that the slave-question was brought within the field of federal authority.

This discussion will demonstrate how very tenaciously the States have clung to real power and authority, and maintained their autonomy in spite of the necessity and the beneficial character of federal action. In other words, although the articles of confederation recognised a common citizenship, each State has insisted on keeping, within as short a compass as possible, the extent of jurisdiction delegated to the Congress. The principle underlying the American Constitution is a conjunction of sovereign States for the purpose of serving certain common interests, each agreeing to give up certain functions, in order that those functions may be jointly exercised for the common good by a body created for the purpose. The powers of the Central Government are limited by a written constitution, which can only be amended by the consent of two-thirds of both the legislative bodies and the execution of those powers is entrusted to three authorities, executive, legislative and judicial. The legislative organisation of the federation, which was originally borrowed from the Connecticut practice, seeks to represent the two elements upon which all federal governments rest; namely, the popular will of the country at large and the opinion of the States. The States themselves have two legislatures, but the purpose of the Second House therein is to ensure

deliberateness in legislation and to escape the taint of precipitate action, which may be taken by a single all-powerful chamber. These two chambers in the various States represent different constituencies, though both come directly from the people. So far as the executive functions are concerned, the President of the United States is the only executive officer of the federal government, who is elected. All other federal officials are appointed by him. Whatever they may be in fact, in theory they are only his advisers. In the various States, on the other hand, the Governor and the officials are all colleagues of each other.

President Woodrow Wilson, in his treatise on *Congressional Government*, thus sums up the fundamentals of the United States organisations: "They consist of a Congress exercising law-making power, a President charged with the execution of the laws and a Supreme Court determining the lawfulness of what is done by individuals, by the State governments, or by federal authorities." The line of division as between federal and State powers is not easy to draw. The weakness of the system has been described as follows, namely, that federal government in the United States as at present constituted lacks strength because its powers are divided, lacks promptness because its authorities are multiplied, lacks directness because its processes are roundabout, lacks efficiency because its responsibility is indistinct and its action without competent direction. Lowell, in fact, has called it government by declamation.

The transcendent success of America in many spheres of life and the general national efficiency ought not to blind us to the many difficulties produced by its constitution, from every one of which framers of new systems and constitutions may take a lesson and warning. It has been justly argued that the speakers of a congressional majority are at liberty to condemn what their own committees are doing. At the same time,

practically all the work of the Congress is done in committee. Nobody stands sponsor for the policy of the government as a whole, and the doctrine of ministerial responsibility is unknown. It has been picturesquely stated that the policy of the American Government may be originated by a dozen men, a dozen more may compromise, twist and alter it and a dozen officers, whose names are known, may put it into execution. Competent thinkers have also often expressed the view that in the United States, though the Congress possesses all legal authority and jurisdiction, the Press and political machines have the greatest weight. Epigrammatically, it has been alleged that the Editor directs public opinion, the Congressman obeys it. Hamilton, himself the originator and father of the constitution, held the view that it would be more easy for the States governments to encroach upon national authority than for the national governments to encroach upon State authorities. This is another of the inherent weaknesses of federal constitutions, where the individual State is the residuary legatee of all power, and it is necessary, therefore, to keep in view always the importance of giving federal authorities all the force which is compatible with liberty. By reason of these conflicts, actual and potential, the balance between the State governments and the federal authorities has to be maintained by the judicial system. Justice Cooley has summarised the position thus:

"The real growth of the power of the Congress has been by its jurisdiction over commerce and the public utility services, and the sole and sufficient legitimate check upon the encroachment of federal power is in the Federal Supreme Court, with competent power to restrain all departments and officers within the limits of their just authority, in so far as their acts come within judicial cognisance."

This survey of the constitution of the United States and its working cannot but make us realise that the

creation of a federal government is a matter of no small difficulty, its working is very complicated, and resort to legal machinery is, from the nature of things, apt to be frequent. There is another difficulty which has to be recognised, and it has arisen not only in the United States but in other federations as well. This difficulty has been very accurately indicated by Keith in his *Imperial Unity and the Dominions.* He remarks that the theory that changes of law, say, for instance, as to legislation regarding pollution of waters can be effected by the parallel action of a number of legislators is one which will not be entertained very readily by any person, who has observed the trouble experienced in the United States, or in any other federation in securing uniformity in different legislatures. Moreover, such divergencies may become very troublesome in business transactions. Each province may insist on having its own type of legislation as to company law or as to insurance or patent, trade mark or copyright, and the best solution therefore would be to make all those federal subjects. But even as to what may be described as essentially State subjects, it would be futile to ask one legislature exactly to follow the precedent of another. Questions of *ultra vires,* the hampering of governments, the weakening of the executive and the possibility of serious disputes between the federation and its members, cannot also be lost sight of, and these latter may become very serious indeed, where the members of a federation are situated at a distance from each other. The danger experienced by Canada owing to the attitude of British Columbia in the Seventies, the failure of the Australian Commonwealth to make the railway between South and Western Australia, and the controversies between Newfoundland and Canada *inter se* and New Zealand and Australia, ought to convey a warning to would-be framers of constitutions. In short, the problem presented and not completely solved by the

United States constitution is the problem of retaining sufficient executive and legislative power at the centre to secure strength and uniformity without trespassing on the legitimate powers of the component States.

I shall next deal with the federations within the British Empire. It is surely needless to recount the earlier history of Canada and the manner in which Durham and his advisers overcame the obstacles in their path, local, personal and Imperial, before Canada was welded into a confederation. Many of the arguments, which are familiar to us in India, were adduced by opponents of the scheme. The French and the English disliked each other intensely. There were conflicts of manners, customs, and religions, and different parts of Canada had attained different stages of educational advancement and political training. Nevertheless, the great experiment was made, and not only has the Canadian constitution vindicated the wisdom of its originators, but it has been the model for many subsequent experiments, the latest of them being that inaugurated in the Irish Free State. Each of the constituent parts of the Canadian Federation had a different history. As in India, so in Canada, several portions came under the British power at various times by settlement, conquest or cession. It became essential both on account of the history of the various provinces and by reason of other over-mastering political considerations, to emphasise the importance and maintain the strength of the central machinery. Not all the provinces were willing to come together, and, therefore, provision was made in the original Act for the admission, as and when they chose, of States like British Columbia and other territories. Newfoundland has not yet availed itself of this provision. The preamble of the British North America Act, 30 Vic., Ch. III, recites that the provinces of Canada, Nova Scotia, and New Brunswick have expressed their desire to be federally united into one Dominion under

the Crown of the United Kingdom. As already stated, provision is made by the Act for the admission into the Union of other parts of British North America. The distinctive feature of the constitution is that the powers of the Dominion or Federal Parliament include all subjects not assigned exclusively to the provincial legislature. In Canada, therefore, the Central Federation is the residuary authority. In the language of Section 91 of the Act, the Parliament of Canada has legislative authority in respect of all matters not assigned exclusively to provincial legislatures, these matters including public debt, regulation of trade and commerce, borrowing money on public credit, military and naval matters, navigation, shipping, currency, coinage, banking, criminal law, etc. The executive power is vested in the Governor-General aided and advised by a Privy Council. Of the two Houses of Parliament, the Upper House is based on a property qualification, the House of Commons being a wholly elected body with exclusive originating powers with regard to appropriation and tax bills. In the provinces, some have bi-cameral and some uni-cameral legislatures. Amongst the subjects assigned to the provincial legislatures are the amendment of the provincial constitution, direct taxation for revenue purposes, the financing and execution of local works and undertakings excepting those extending beyond the province or connecting with other provinces and excepting also other works which, the Dominion Government declares, are for the general good. Certain backward portions of Canada are governed by Commissioners assisted by Councils, e.g., the north-west territory and the Yukon. Each Minister is paid a salary of 10,000 dollars a year, the Prime Minister 15,000 dollars, the leader of the opposition receiving a salary of 10,000 dollars in addition to the sessional allowance which every member receives of 4,000 dollars subject to deduction for non-attendance. The Canadian constitution, by common

consent, has been an outstanding success, and not only has Canada greatly prospered under it, but it has attained such a position that at the present moment, it is practically treated as a separate international entity. During the War, each Dominion not only took an active part in the direction of the British Commonwealth's War efforts, but received a recognised place in the War Council, and at the Paris Peace Conference and the Washington Disarmament Conference there was distinctive representation of the Dominions. Finally, the British and Dominion Governments have definitely agreed that the principles of autonomy and equal nationhood shall govern their future political relations, this of course implying that the Dominions have an adequate voice in foreign policy. All this was largely achieved through Canadian efforts. Canadian statesmen were last year elected to the Council of the League of Nations and sat side by side with the representatives of Great Britain, France, Germany and Japan; and Canada sends its own Minister plenipotentiary to Washington, and the United States sends a Minister to Canada. Canada has thus not only worked out her national salvation by means of her constitution, but has created for herself an international position of importance.

The wisdom of the Canadian settlement and the beneficent results achieved by it will be realised all the more vividly if we bear in mind the posture of affairs during some years before the passing of the British North American Act. In various ways, a spirit of antagonism was manifesting itself between the French inhabitants and the British population settled in Canada. The temporary truce, which prevailed during the War of 1812 was soon succeeded by grave internal political difficulties. The Legislative and Executive Councils were at open variance with popular representative assemblies. Strife prevailed between Upper and Lower Canada. The natural position of Quebec and Montreal

gave Lower Canada a special position as to exports and imports. There were serious financial misunderstandings between the provinces respecting their share of import duties. Although there was a Legislative Union between the two provinces carried out in 1841, it was found that the British were divided on old English party lines, but the French Canadians, united by race and religion, were able to hold the balance of power between the British parties. Thus it was that a practical deadlock was in existence until the happy solution was reached of a Federative Union, reserving to each State the control of its own local government. The effects of this great experiment cannot be described better than in the language of the Earl of Dufferin, who, speaking of the Canadian spirit after the Act had been worked for a few years, declared: "I should be the first to deplore this feeling if it rendered Canada disloyal to herself, if it either dwarfed or smothered Canadian patriotism or generated a sickly spirit of dependence. Such however is far from being the case. The legislation of the Parliament of Canada, the attitude of its statesmen, the language of its Press, sufficiently show how firmly and intelligently its people are prepared to accept and apply the almost unlimited legislative faculties, with which it has been endowed, while the daily growing disposition to extinguish sectional jealousies and to ignore obsolete provincialism, prove how strongly the heart of the confederated Commonwealth has begun to throb with the consciousness of its national existence. Yet so far from this gift of autonomy having brought about a divergence of aim or aspiration on either side, the sentiments of Canada towards Great Britain are infinitely more friendly now than in those early days, when the political intercourse of the two countries was disturbed and complicated by an excessive and untoward tutelage." These are words of profound statesmanship and wide applicability. Only superficial observers can say that the

Canadian constitution is a copy of the American. That the framers of the Quebec Resolutions adopted portions of the American system is undoubted, but every care was taken to avoid those weak points in that system, which the experience of years had brought to light. "We can now," said Sir John MacDonald, when moving in the Legislative Assembly of Canada the resolution in favour of the Union, "take advantage of the experience of the last 78 years, during which the United States constitution has existed, and I am strongly of belief that we have in a great measure avoided in this system, which we propose for the adoption of the people of Canada, the defects which time and events have shown to exist in the American constitution." The election of a President for a term of 4 years, the independence of the President, during this period, both of his Ministers and of Congress, and the delegation to the Central Government of definite, specified powers leaving the balance of legislative power in the States, are three of the most important characteristics of the United States constitution. But not one of these principles was adopted in Canada. The executive authority was vested in the Crown, represented in Canada by a Governor-General appointed by the Crown, who is required to act by the advice of a Ministry *responsible to the Canadian Parliament.* Specified powers only are given to the provinces, the balance of legislative power being lodged in the Dominion or in the British Parliament, for the belief prevailed in Canada that the exceptional powers of the American States and the doctrine of State rights had been leading factors in bringing about the great Civil War.

Some unexpected constitutional developments have occurred in Canada as in the United States. In the States, there is no more characteristic feature than the growth of the power of the Senate as compared with the decreased influence of the House of Representatives.

In Canada, on the other hand, the influence of the House of Commons has grown at the expense of the Senate. Two reasons may be assigned for this. In the first place, the Canadian Senators are nominated by the Governor-General as the representatives of the Crown, whereas the American Senators are elected by the State Legislatures and an elected body tends to become more powerful than a nominated body. The system of nomination is indeed sufficient of itself to explain the decadence of the Canadian Senate; but the election of the Senators by the State Legislatures is not sufficient to account for the power of the American Upper House. Such a method of election is not far removed from the method of nomination. The real cause of the predominance of the latter body seems to lie in the fact that all Ministers and officials are appointed by the Senate, though nominated by the President. No such power has been given to the Canadian Senate. All Ministers and officials are appointed by the Governor-General as representing the Crown, though such appointments, when not the result of an examination, are made on the advice of the Privy Council.

A second unexpected result has been the conflict between at least one of the provinces and the Dominion. When the framers of the constitution provided that all powers not specifically delegated to the provinces should remain with the Dominion, it was thought that all danger of conflict between the central authority and the province had been removed. The exercise of the Governor-General's right of veto in the case of the Manitoba Railway Acts showed that it was not the case, and that where the veto is exercised, not on the ground that the province has exceeded its legislative powers but on grounds of "general policy", a conflict may arise. It should be added that the Dominion is fully alive to the necessity of rarely interfering with provincial legislation, except where it is clearly illegal.

The Commonwealth of Australia Act, 63 & 64 Vic., Ch. XII, is also an attempt at Federation. It begins by reciting that the people of New South Wales, Victoria, South Australia, Queensland and Tasmania, humbly relying upon the blessings of Almighty God, have agreed to unite into one indissoluble Commonwealth under the Crown of the United Kingdom. Under Section 51 of the Act, the legislative power of the Federal Parliament in Australia includes commerce, shipping, finance, banking, currency, defence, external affairs, postal and telegraph and like services, census and statistics, weights and measures, copyright, railways, and conciliation and arbitration in industrial disputes extending beyond the limits of any one district. But the Federal Parliament in Australia is a legislature with limited and enumerated powers, the several States retaining the residuary power of government over their respective territories as in the case of the United States. The Senate or Upper House is chosen for a term of six years, there being six Senators for each original State. The Lower House or the House of Representatives is chosen in proportion to the respective numbers of the people. Recent Australian history has revealed the same difficulties in the working of this federal constitution as have become apparent in the United States.

The first ten years of the Commonwealth were somewhat disturbed and the evolution of parties and political creeds did not proceed fast, nor did the people easily begin to think in terms of the Commonwealth rather than of a group of States. It was the War that gave that common aim, which the years of peace did not afford. Although the construction of the Trans-Continental Railway, the provision of compulsory military training and the creation of the Australian Navy were initiated before the War, yet it must be remembered that even the erection of a Federal Capital at Canberra at first aroused feelings of jealousy and

derision. There were very sharp divisions on questions of tariffs and taxation, which were succeeded by a cleavage between political Labour and the force that opposed it. The rise of Labour in politics was a remarkable feature of Australian growth. At the end of 1925, it was the main force in opposition to the federal government, and it actually held office in every State, excepting Victoria. The rise of Labour in Australia has been thus described: "The broad lines of the movement may be said to have run along the ever-increasing education of the working classes to political power, the application of the machinery of the great Unions towards party ends and the determination of the Labour leaders that their influence should extend far beyond the industrial, as distinct from the political, life of the community." The apprehensions of those who feared revolutionary changes as a result of the political activities of organised Labour have been falsified and the rigidity of the Australian constitution has been demonstrated by experience, and proposals which obtained the necessary statutory authority in both Houses of Parliament were generally lost when they were referred to the people. The position of the States as originally contemplated has been to a certain extent altered by the activity of the High Court, which under the terms of the constitution is made the final interpreter of the constitution. The High Court of Australia has enunciated the following doctrine in connection with cases of overlapping of State and Federal powers, viz., that Section 109 of the Act gives supremacy not to any particular class of Commonwealth Acts, but to every Commonwealth Act over not merely State Acts passed under concurrent powers but over all State Acts though passed under an exclusive power if any provisions of the two conflict. This decision given in the Amalgamated Society of Engineers *vs.* the Adelaide Steamship Co., really amounts to a new principle obviously affecting the status of the States and

detracting from their autonomy. By one or two other decisions of the High Court, State legislation as to the creation of new types of property and as to restrictions on the sale of commodities, was declared *ultra vires.* There is thus observed in Australia the tendency to enhance the powers of the Federal Legislature or at all events to exclude certain fields of legislation from the jurisdiction of the States, thus bringing the constitution of Australia if not in theory at least in practice nearer to the Canadian ideal. This result, be it remarked, is effectuated by what may be termed judicial legislation.

The South African Act, IX, Ed. VII, Ch. IX, was a legislative union of the already self-governing colonies of the Cape of Good Hope, Natal, Transvaal and the Orange River Colony. The Upper House consists of 8 nominated and 32 elected members, and the House of Assembly consists of 135 elected members. Although it is difficult to give summary judgments on the work of the legislatures and governments, it cannot but be admitted that the South African constitution has not been as successful as the Canadian in welding together, for common national endeavour, the various elements of the population, aboriginal, Dutch, English and Indian. Although the South African Colonies and Republics became united in 1910 under a common administration, the Commonwealth did not soon enter upon the longed-for era of racial reconciliation and material progress. The first Union Parliament gave rise to a predominantly Dutch Ministry, and racial jealousies have been a feature of some of the administrations. A great deal of patient and uphill work had to be done by General Botha to carry out economic reforms in the matter of using the State railways as agencies of taxation, the reorganisation of the Civil Service and the apportionment of the revenue between the Provincial and Central Administrations. The reorganisation of the railways led to a series of dissensions, and in 1912, the well-known speech of

General Hertzog was made, which declared that when the proper time came, South Africa will look after its own interests first and those of the Empire afterwards. This speech led to the cleavage between Botha and Hertzog, and the Asiatic legislation and the disturbances of the Rand led up to a situation which is still in a position of unstable equilibrium. The post-war attitude of the political parties has to a certain extent mellowed the acerbities of the situation, but even after the modification, by General Hertzog as Prime Minister, of his previous declaration and his averment that secession would be a flagrant mistake, there is still a very strong secessionist party in South Africa and the political segregation of the natives is one of the problems on which cleavage in thought and action is most manifest. The Flag question, and what is usually styled the Native question, are still factors which not only detract from the solidarity of the parties but are the outward manifestations of what may be a serious disruptive tendency. How far these disharmonies are the result of the imperfection of the constitution, and how far they are based on other and equally fundamental reasons, cannot yet be affirmed with certitude. There has been a very perceptible tug-of-war between the Dutch and the English elements, and it is only the limited population and the vast resources of the country that have enabled it to tide over the many crises, which have confronted it.

We now pass on to certain federal constitutions fashioned by countries and races remaining outside British or rather Anglo-Saxon influence. After the deposition of Don Pedro II in 1889, Brazil was declared a Republic under the title of the United States of Brazil. This Federal Union consists of 20 States, a national territory purchased in 1902 and a federal State. Each of the federal provinces forms a State administered at its own expense without interference from the federal government, excepting for defence, for the maintenance of

order and for the execution of the federal laws. Fiscal arrangements in such matters as import duties, stamps, postage rates and circulation of bank notes belong to the Union, but export dues are the property of the various States. Here, as in most modern constitutions, the Lower House is constituted on a population basis, the Upper House being chosen at the rate of three Senators for each State. The executive authority of the State is vested in the President, who holds office for four years and is not eligible for a second term. In order to avoid dictatorships, provision is made that no candidate for Presidentship must be related by blood or marriage in the first or second degree to the actual President or Vice-President or a person who has ceased to be President or Vice-President within six months. The Ministers have no right of audience in Congress, but communicate with the Congress by letter or in conferences with Committees. The Federal Ministers are not responsible to the Congress. Each State in the Federal Union is organised separately and the Governors and the members of the Legislatures are all elected.

The new federal constitution of Mexico was promulgated on the 5th February 1917. By the terms of this constitution, Mexico is declared a federative republic divided into States. There are 28 States, one federal district and two territories. Each separate State has its own internal constitution, government and laws. Inter-State customs duties are not permitted. Each State has its own special codes, but it must publish and enforce laws issued by the federal government. Though each State has a right to manage its local affairs, the whole is bound together by certain fundamental and constitutional laws. Here, as in the United States, the powers of the Federation are divided into three branches, legislative, executive and judicial, the legislative power being vested in a Congress consisting of a House of Representatives and a Senate, representatives being

elected for two years by universal suffrage, and the Senators being elected two for each state. The President is also elected. He is ineligible for re-election, and he appoints Secretaries of State.

Under the new German constitution promulgated by the National Assembly at Weimar on the 11th August 1919, the federal matters are: foreign relations, defence, customs duties, taxation and railway services.

There is a Lower House and a State Council. The Cabinet appointed by the President must, however, enjoy the confidence of the Reichstag, that is, the Lower House. The principle of ministerial responsibility is thus introduced at the centre, this feature differentiating the German system from the American model. This constitution is also noteworthy inasmuch as it is based, both in the Federal and State legislatures, on universal franchise and elections also are regulated according to the principle of proportional representation.

In the Union of the Socialistic Soviet Republics, as in most other constitutions, there is provision made for two chambers, the Union Council consisting of 450 members elected on the principle of proportional representation by the people of the constituent republics and the Council of Nationalities elected on the basis of five members for every independent and autonomous republic and one member for every autonomous region.

In the constitution of the Irish Free State laid down by the Irish Free State Agreement Act of 1922, its status in the community of nations known as the British Empire is assimilated to that of the Dominion of Canada. Provision is also made in the Act for a Referendum and for the Initiative on the Swiss model. Election to the Lower House is on the principle of proportional representation, and the term of office is four years. The Senate or Upper House is also elected, and its members must be citizens who have done honour to the nation by reason of useful public services or who represent

important aspects of the nation's life, the duration of the Senate being twelve years.

From the above rapid analysis of many of the federal constitutions of the world, the following conclusions emerge. The recent tendency has been to rely upon a federation in all cases, where different political units desire to come together for common political ends. In practically all these constitutional experiments, the federal legislature is composed of two Houses, one representative of the various States or political units and the other of the people at large. In all these experiments, moreover, the various States have got their own legislatures and executives, the executive being chosen by and responsible to the respective States in greater or less degree, the legislature being sometimes unicameral, sometimes bi-cameral. There are, however, notable differences in the extent of authority of the States, and in the jurisdiction and powers of the Federal and State legislatures and executives. There are also important divergences as to the respective authorities of the legislative and judicial machinery, ranging from parliamentary omnipotence to the supremacy of federal courts. Some countries like Germany have adopted the principle of responsibility of the federal executive to the federal legislature. Others have made the federal executive the nominees of the chief of the federal government. This, however, has happened only in cases, where the head of the federal Government is himself the nominee of the people, is elected by them and is their true representative. Nevertheless, the legal authority of the President of the United States is almost supreme and is unique among the advanced countries. I am not of course comparing it with the practical dictatorships of Italy and Spain, which are the results of a reaction against a badly worked parliamentary system.

The predilection of modern constitutional writers and publicists has been in favour of the federal model

rather than of the unitary government. In India also, there has been considerable discussion as to the possibility of a federal re-organisation of the country. Without entering into present-day politics and political controversies, I shall only point out that in the Montagu-Chelmsford Report of 1919, it was recognised that some kind of collective consultation and some means of deliberation between the Government of India and the various Princes on matters of common interest to both, must be devised. It was admitted that in the present condition of things, many States were vitally affected by decisions taken by the Central Government of India and by the Secretary of State without reference to them. It was realised that there was no machinery for collective consultation and it was conceded that the Indian States, at all events, had a clear right to ask for such collective consultation in the future. The scheme was adumbrated of a Council of Princes, a Council of State and a Privy Council, and the ideal was envisaged of constituting a machinery for bringing what were termed the Senatorial institution of British India into close relation with the rulers of Native States. There was hinted the possibility of joint deliberation between the Council of State and the Chamber of Princes. The idea was also adumbrated of Princes serving on committees of the Privy Council, which was sought to be brought into existence. The outlines of this federal arrangement, if such it can be called, were obviously very sketchy, and like some of the more recent speculations in that direction, including Sir Leslie Scott's, it suffers from the serious defect of failing to recognise two factors of considerable moment: (1) the people of the Indian States and (2) the need to co-ordinate the political and economic ideals of the Indian States on the one hand and of the people of India on the other, in matters of common concern.

Various political bodies and individuals in India have exercised themselves in the task of constitution-

building. Mr. S. Sreenivasa Iyengar, President of the Indian National Congress, 1926, in his publication entitled *An Outline of the Swaraj Constitution,* has initiated a discussion as to whether the future constitution of India should be on the federal model or the unitary. He attacks the theory of unitary Government with concurrent powers vested in the Central and Provincial legislatures, in provincial subjects. He combats the argument that under a unitary Government, a conflict would be avoided between central and provincial authorities, and does not share the belief that under a unitary Government, there would be less chance of the domination of one community over another. His arguments in favour of the federal system are these: (1) The importance and the necessity of gradually including the Indian States which may fit into a federal India whilst retaining independence in domestic affairs (2) The prevention of the acquisition by any dominant caucus of too much power. According to him, and in his own language, "A federal democracy is the best safeguard against the springing up of ambitious oligarchies, commercial or militarist." His pamphlet is a suggestive contribution to the discussion of the subject, and has the great merit of drawing pointed attention to the eastern conception of the law of *Dharma* as being above and beyond the Sovereign. He contends that many Indian institutions, although autocratic in form, are really democratic by instinct. The Commonwealth of India Bill of 1915, which owes its inception to the industry and enthusiasm of Dr. Besant, and which rightly stresses the importance of organising the constitution from the village upwards, and most of the other draft constitutions so far attempted, including Sir Abdur Rahim's, prefer the centripetal federation of Canada to the federalism of the United States or Australia.

Having examined the main features of some of the federal constitutions of the world, let me for a moment

analyse the objects of all Governments and constitutions. It has been aptly and truly asserted that in order to satisfy the just and legitimate demands of the citizen, a Government should have these essential characteristics. It should be strong enough to defend itself from outside attacks and keep peace at home and administer justice. This requisite of Government has been well described in a recent and thought-provoking book entitled *Roads and Axes* by A. L. Carthill who is also responsible for the *Lost Dominion.* "Every Government must be strong enough," he says, "to coerce the criminal and the rebel, the former being the man who sets up his private will and the latter the man who sets up the will of a section against the will of the community." The second requisite of Government is that it should have the vision to perceive and to diagnose the evils that affect the body politic. But however strong and wise a Government may be, no Government and no constitution has a long "expectation of life" in the phraseology of Insurance Law, unless it adapts itself to the national genius, and unless, moreover, it works in consonance with the dictates of the Time Spirit. A form of Government imposed from without has less chances of survival than one which is evolved spontaneously. In fact, a Government being one of the manifestations of racial or national spirit, must express in the political field its special aptitudes and outlook. The same writer dealing with this particular topic makes some pertinent observations. "A Government which is a mechanical one, for instance, which is imposed from without or from above, however skilfully it may be constructed, and however efficiently it may work for a time, yet by the very fact that it is a mechanism, is a dead thing, and possesses no flexibility. Sooner or later, the time will come when stresses which it was not designed to bear can no longer be coerced by its rigid frame-work, and the whole cunning structure will fall into irrepar-

able ruin. Destruction in due time awaits the organism also, but the death of an organism is a benign and fertilising process compared to the ruin of a machine."

This is a period when fundamentals are being examined and re-examined and no single political solution can be all-embracing or totally satisfying. A nation like the Italian, which organised the best type of medieval City State and convulsed modern Europe with its national efforts, is now apparently doubtful of the efficacy of Parliamentary Government as understood in recent European history. In certain countries, a Supreme Chief is often associated as a co-equal colleague of Parliament, having powers not dependent on the will of Parliament. Large socialistic experiments shifting the centre of gravity of Parliamentary authority are in progress in certain countries; but whatever may be the extent or validity of these endeavours, the maxim of Aristotle is applicable to them all. "Every form of Government or Administration must contain a supreme power over the whole State. This supreme power must necessarily be in the hands of one person or a few or many. Such States are well governed when these apply their power for the common good. But they are ill-governed when the interest of the one or the few or the many who enjoy this power are alone consulted." The next passage on the same work contains a statement which is both the argument and the justification for democracy and for federation. Aristotle proceeds to observe: "For, either affirm that those who make up the community are not citizens or let those share in the advantages of Government". This share of the common people in the advantages of Government is what is attempted, and can be conferred only by a successful Parliamentary system. The success of any Parliament depends upon a franchise and electoral system, which make it sufficiently representative of the opinion

of the country. As important as this requisite is the condition that, while Parliament should control the executive, it should not destroy its initiative or impair its authority in the things that are essential to proper Government.

It is at this point that there arises the need to examine the efficacy and the utility of a strong Executive Government, and no system or constitution can be pronounced successful which does not secure this end. Parliamentary Government is, as already stated, on its trial, and one of the institutions, which is most canvassed is the Second Chamber, which is a common feature in federal systems, and which, in some of these systems, shares a part of the executive power with the head of the State, e.g., the Foreign Relations Committee of the American Senate. Having regard to what has been stated above, it is worth considering whether in order to secure efficient legislation whilst keeping intact the power of the Central Executive, there should not be a complete re-orientation of ideas regarding the functions and jurisdiction of a Second Chamber. *Apropos* of this subject, a very fruitful speculation was initiated by Mr. Spender in his book on *Public Life*, wherein he has discussed the possibility of "a Second Chamber being a preparatory, rather than a revising chamber, a chamber which shall prepare the ground for legislation on burning questions, provide Government and the public with all the available knowledge on these subjects, show what the alternative solutions are, and which, if any, of the solutions are barred by economic facts or unforeseen consequences, a chamber, in fact, which would provide all the essential knowledge, which is so apt to be obscured in the battle of parties and their electioneering cries" and, I may add, so apt to be obscured also in the battle between the conflicting claims of various States or component units of a federation.

If the considerations detailed above lead to the con-

clusion that the future constitution of India cannot be constructed save on a federal basis, the following problems arise for discussion and solution. Some of the solutions may be tentative and temporary and others permanent.

1. The re-grouping of the provinces on the lines of linguistic and cultural or historic and administrative unity.

2. Indian States with their varying sizes and importance and differences in political evolution. Federation in the sense of each Indian State being considered equal in voting power to every other State would be impracticable. The question, therefore, arises of a resort to a system of grouping of certain States, in order to enable them to play their part in such a federation.

3. The careful circumscribing of interference in internal matters, both in the case of the provinces and of the Indian States, the limitation in the latter originating from treaties and political practice, and in the former from motives of administrative convenience.

4. The drawing up of a list of subjects, in regard to which federal activity is legitimate, such a list excluding matters having a direct bearing on internal administration. A tentative list is appended herein below:—

(*a*) Transport and communications (Inter-State, Inter-Provincial and All-India).

(*b*) Rights in water for irrigation or other purposes and inland navigation, where more than one State or Province are concerned.

(*c*) Merchant shipping including coastal navigation.

(*d*) Customs and tariffs including bounties.

(*e*) Coinage and currency. The future Federal Reserve Bank, which is inevitable.

(*f*) Codification of commercial law.

(*g*) Weights and Measures.

(*h*) Extradition.

(*i*) Labour questions of a general character.

(*j*) Public health and emigration questions having a more than local importance.

(*k*) And, of course, all questions of defence and armaments and foreign policy.

5. The consideration of the creation of a Privy Council composed of representatives both of the Provinces and of the States and their Rulers, from out of which the federal executive may be chosen and which may be utilised as a consultative body for many purposes as in England, Canada and even in Imperial Japan. The executives to be chosen must enjoy the confidence of the appropriate Legislatures and the device of the Privy Council is not suggested as an oligarchical apparatus.

6. The vesting of residuary and exceptional jurisdiction in federal matters in the representative of the Sovereign.

7. The creation of a new federal legislative body, wherein the representatives of the various provinces and of the Indian States would sit. The other alternative of the inclusion, in one or other of the present legislative bodies, of a certain number of Indian State representatives is not practicable for the following reasons:—

(*a*) The internal administration of Indian States not forming the appropriate subject of legislation by the Federal legislative body, it may be well argued that Indian States representatives should not play any prominent part in legislation solely appertaining to British Indian affairs.

(*b*) It would be inconvenient to include representatives of Indian States in a body which will mostly deal with subjects on which they cannot and ought not to exert any decisive influence.

(*c*) The creation of a body, representative solely of Indian States, forming a separate chamber of the

legislature, operating only on matters affecting Indian States, is also objectionable, the ground being that it will not be possible to secure that co-ordinate action, which will only arise as a result of mutual compromise and give and take, where a homogeneous legislative body functions as such, its powers extending over the whole country.

8. The elimination of all ideas of creating a rigid Super-State.

9. The election of a tribunal for the purpose of giving opinions on what may be called justifiable matters, which will inevitably arise in the working of any written constitution, such a tribunal having jurisdiction at least in its earlier stages (*a*) to hear and determine any dispute which parties thereto may submit and (*b*) to give an advisory opinion in certain circumstances and classes of cases.

10. The question of vesting taxation or revenue-raising powers in federal bodies, and for the purpose of avoiding acute controversies or deadlocks, the laying down of some such proposition as follows:—

That if a certain proportion of Indian States representatives or British Indian representatives be opposed to any fiscal policy or policy of taxation, such a policy should not be carried out for a specified period.

11. A Second Chamber of the kind described above would be invaluable on such occasions as well as in connection with controversial, social and economic legislation.

12. The very difficult problem of the distribution of customs revenue among the component political units in proportion either to population or volume of trade or on some other workable hypothesis.

On the adequate and speedy solution of these problems, and on the creation of such a political machinery as will revive village and district autonomy, and will, at the same time, erect thereupon a federal system com-

patible alike with the utmost practicable freedom of action to local legislatures and with a strong and one-pointed central executive, free from the influence of caucuses and responsive and responsible to the Central Legislature and the general public opinion, will depend the contentment and progress of Indian India as well as of British India.

5. A FAMILY OF PATRIOTS*

Mrs. Krishna Hutheesing has essayed a task, easy at first sight, but really very taxing. Her autobiography is necessarily the biography of the Nehru family, so varied in their up-bringing and life-history but so linked together in their idealism and courage.

Bravely does the author challenge the world with her title "With No Regrets". And the story is one of daring and peril and is compact of as much suffering as happiness. A bright smile with unshed tears may not be inappropriate as a simile.

A poet describes mankind thus:

"We are children of splendour and flame;
Of shuddering also and tears".

The history of the Nehru family from the middle age of Pandit Motilal Nehru up to this moment is one to which that description can be justly applied.

I first knew the elder Pandit as a great lawyer who commanded legendary fees and who lived a life of refined luxury and lavish hospitality, who was no anchorite but whose personal nobility was unsullied. He belonged to a generation which was just beginning to realise that India had rights as well as obligations and that it counted in the past and will count in the future for a great deal. That generation was nevertheless convinced that English institutions and manners, the English style of living and European art and letters, were the central facts of the evolving world. In that belief his family was brought up, and this narrative describes the training undergone by Swarup and Krishna under the aegis of Miss Hooper who taught the girls to play on the piano and to mix well in society. Jawahar stepped into the

* Review dated 13th March 1944 of the book 'With No Regrets' by Mrs. Krishna Hutheesing.

scene of the author's life in 1912 on his return from England as a finished and typical product of occidental training. The first World War, the marriage of Jawahar and of Swarup are all seen as incidents in a sheltered and aristocratic life which was soon to be wholly transformed.

Gandhi's visit to the celebrated and historic family-house in Allahabad in 1920, the struggle on the part of Jawahar to join Gandhiji who had launched the Satyagraha movement, the sharp pyschological conflicts between Jawahar and Pandit Motilal and the final conversion of the latter who gave up everything to make his son's path easier are all part of recent Indian history; but not equally well known are such intimate details as Panditji's trying to sleep on the floor to find out what jail life may be like. I am glad that the author has not omitted to mention even the little episode of the killing of the cobra which was a "familiar spirit" of their house and whose death was regarded as a forerunner of bad luck. Motilal finally decided whole-heartedly to throw in his lot with Jawahar, and he who had literally earned millions and spent his fortune lavishly had perforce to learn the meaning of comparative poverty and practise the lesson of giving up not only luxuries but even some necessities. Those pages in which are set out the sale of the family horses and carriages, the giving up of riding, the dismissal of servants, the abolition of butlers and banquets, the disposal of curios and Venetian and China glass and porcelain, are parts of a story which, for poignancy, is hard to rival. All that happened must have affected Panditji and his wife very greatly, but they did not mind it and certainly did not show it. The refashioning of life at the ages of 55 or 60 and the breaking away of life-long friends, who could not see eye to eye with them, was no small thing. To the visitors and friends who used to come in smart cars or carriages, simple and humble *khadi*-clad acquaintances and all

sorts and conditions of political workers succeeded. From the 6th of December 1921 right to the end, the Police paid successive visits to *Ananda Bhavan* for the purpose either of arresting persons there or of searching the buildings.

And so the story goes on and is inseparable from the history of the Home Rule League and the Indian National Congress and the Swaraj Party in the Assembly and the evolution of Jawaharlal's long and consistent championship of Gandhiji's tenets. Such loyalty and championship was all the more remarkable because of the inevitable differences in their outlook towards the problems of life and in the matter of the rebuilding of India's industrial and economic future. From first to last, the life of the members of this family may be regarded as a spectacle of fervent loyalties triumphing over preconceived ideas and life-long habits.

Unlike many other autobiographies, this volume eschews all irritating reticences and the quaint courtship of Krishna and Raja is set out with appealing candour. Few parts of the book are more striking than the account of the last days of the author's mother who gave up her old life of plenty and luxury and reconciled herself to uncertainty and hardship and bereavements. Some of the most moving passages in the book relate to the death of Kamala Nehru and of the author's mother, but what gripped me most was the history of Bibi Amma, the author's heroic aunt, who was the inseparable companion of Mrs. Motilal and who passed away within 24 hours after her.

The book deals, at some length, with the visit of Jawahar and of the author to Ceylon in 1939 and ends with the latest episode, the arrests of 1942.

There have been few family groups that have evinced, in such measure, so many and such varied qualities as this, which comprised Pandit Motilal, one of Nature's noble men who developed unsuspected depths

of sacrifice and renunciation; Jawahar, the possessor of a highly cultivated and logical mind who, nevertheless, is full of humour and abounding love for children and whose essential puritanism and practical genius are interwoven with far-glancing dreams; his sisters who, endowed with different temperaments, have nevertheless been united in programme and ideals. One may agree or disagree with the plans conceived and the scheme of life chosen by this family, but, in their several ways, its members exemplify the dauntless courage and the quenchless idealism that have made of them the ideals of Indian youth. The husband of the author, regardless of his delicate health, has linked his fate with Jawahar's and is today out of jail on parole.

To the making of this book have gone not only the gift of apt phrasing and a sense of the dramatic and the heroic elements of human life, but a freedom from bitterness or repining which is as rare as it is remarkable.

It was a matter of pride to me that Pandit Motilal called me his friend, in addition to my being his legal adviser on more than one occasion. I had been Jawahar's colleague in the Home Rule League. I parted in thought from him during the non-co-operation days and we have not spared each other in controversy. But what do these differences signify? Can any one deny that the central figures of recent Indian history have been Gandhiji and the two Pandits, father and son? And when I look back on the happenings of our times and try to sum up the contribution made by the Nehru family, each one of them may well be described in these words:

"An honoured labourer for the amity
And weal of peoples, loftier things than sway".

This is not a full scale history but a series of sketches, and the country has reason to be grateful to the author not only for what she describes and reveals but also for her unspoken thoughts and, above all, her restraints.

6. RANADE AND HIS TIMES *

Mr. Srinivasa Sastri, ladies and gentlemen,

Would it be very inappropriate on the part of a lecturer to commence the remarks that he proposes to permit himself to make, by inaugurating those remarks with a word of affectionate reproach? There are two charges that I lay at the door of the Rt. Hon'ble Sastri. (Rt. Hon'ble Sastri: I plead guilty in advance.) I am not taken in. I am a sufficiently experienced lawyer to know that when a witness or a lawyer on the other side makes too many concessions, those concessions are denied. But that was not what I desired to say. To have introduced me to an audience with those over-generous prefatory remarks which fell from him is to expect the audience to be far too hyper-critical. So he has already clipped my wings in advance. My second charge is that he has taken words out of my mouth, not literally because it is too difficult to emulate the diction of Mr. Sastri; but he has taken the *rapport* of ideas with which I came to this Hall so that I am now in a position of having to fend for myself.

My friends, you are aware what a river does when an anicut or a dam is thrown across its course. It diverts its course and goes another way, and that is what I propose to do. I propose now, within the time allotted to me, definitely to speak not so much of Mahadev Govind Ranade from the point of view of personal anecdotes or attempt to summarise or review his biography or achievements as an economist or politician—I deli-

* Speech delivered at the Ranade Hall, Madras, on 19th January 1943, under the auspices of the South Indian National Association in honour of the Birthday of Mahadev Govind Ranade. The Rt. Hon'ble V. S. Srinivasa Sastri presided.

berately use the word 'politician'—but I would rather take you with me on a voyage of reconnaissance to the times during which Ranade flourished. I would place before you some of the characteristics and some of the stigmata of those times so that you may have some idea of the background in which he worked.

The year 1842 was the year of Mahadev Govind Ranade's birth; and what was the state of things in 1842? Macaulay had started his deadening, though well-meant, educational curriculum for Indian schools. The dress, the deportment and the language of the Englishman became the standard for the Indian. I am not uttering any word of censure on the dress of persons present here. Until the other day, until my tailor in London taught me what to do, I used to wear, in common with the practices of my generation, the utmost stylish European costume. When I went to London on the first occasion, my tailor who happened to be the tailor of my sons found me not having properly dressed. He told me that the tie I wore was wrong, that it did not suit the socks, that the waist-coat and tie were discordant, etc. These sartorial harmonies were not evident in my make-up. The result was I had to cut the Gordian knot and jettison the European costume. What was true of the outer vesture was true of the inner make-up of the India of 1842-90. The average Indian dared not think except in terms of European dress, dared not live except in terms of Europe. And what does Surendranath Banerjea say in his Autobiography? As soon as he returned from England, he thought that the best thing that an Indian could do was to demonstrate the complete emancipation from the thraldom that lay over India. He says that in a revealing flash in his Autobiography. That was the background of the time when Ranade was born—a not unnatural background. Macaulay had stated that the Indian educational system based on a single page of Shakespeare was more impor-

tant and greater in value than the *Puranas* and literature of India. He said it was a positive disservice to the country to be allowed to be fed and nurtured on those indigestible, nay, deleterious books when all the resources of civilisation were at their disposal. Mahadev Govind Ranade—I propose to call him a path-finder—was born in that environment. He went through the usual course of study which most of the bright young men of those days took. He was the favourite of Alexander Grant, a discerning European Professor of his College. He was one of the pet pupils of Prof. Grant, as some pupils were found to be pet pupils of Prof. Porter of this Presidency. At that time, to be noticed by an Englishman, to be regarded as something above what may be called pristine, the normal run of students, was to attain to greatness. The lawyer on the look-out for patronage from Judges, students from Principals, felt a thrill of exultation when they were recognised. A foreign Degree, earned without much trouble but with spending money by way of taxi-fares and dinners, counted far more than the Degrees obtained under the meticulous discipline of humdrum teaching.

Ranade was one of the first to arouse the spirit of nationalism in India by his rendering of the Mahratta History and his vindication of Shivaji's character, exploding many superstitions that surrounded the life of Shivaji. He then returned to Economics. He had in those days—perhaps history may repeat itself—to emphasise and to stress and to re-stress that, in the mysterious dispensation of Providence, it may perhaps be given to India not only to produce raw materials for manufacturing industries elsewhere but to industrialise herself and stand shoulder to shoulder with the other self-reliant and progressive nations of the world. He was one of the first economists to fight against the laissez-faire doctrine, which was indulged in by prosperous nations who built up an inescapable supremacy in trade and commerce so

that, with the blessings of Providence, they may rule the world.

It is not so much as a historian, not so much as an economist or essayist, but as a personality that Ranade counted. It is one of the misfortunes of India that, having inherited, nay, originated, the system of *Guru-Sishya Parampara* and the creation of *Gurukula*, none of our social and political leaders had built up a school behind them—though they had signalised themselves in various directions—to carry on their traditions and teachings. In England they have got the school of Darwin, the school of Herbert Spencer and others, but where have we in India the school of our great men, scientists, historians, politicians and statesmen, who could say that, after them, their mantle will fall on somebody nearly equal to them, that their tradition will be carried forward, that their personality will be transmitted? Alas! such schools have been rare in this country.

The first and most conspicuous attempt to found a school of politics and a line of disciples was made by Ranade, and it is that aspect of Ranade's career on which I should like to dwell for a moment. Ranade was a High Court Judge. Even before he became a High Court Judge, he threw himself into the work of social reform and he was one of the founders of the *Prarthana Samaj*, a leading institution of his place. He braved many attacks in this direction. In his days, people dared not talk much about political reform. But Ranade braved all that. I knew Ranade. As a Judge many of my contemporaries knew him. He was present at Social Conferences, which generally preceded or succeeded the Indian National Congress. He was not a member of the Indian National Congress. He was not even an elected delegate to the Congress; but one could find his handiwork in the Draft Resolutions that came up for discussion before the Congress. He desired to leave behind a self-reliant group of persons, bound by laborious work

to assert the claims and to vindicate the dignity and self-respect of India. In Social Conferences, his speeches breathed the loftiest patriotism, avowedly non-political but intrinsically political in importance; and in the labours of the Congress itself he continued to play the part of mentor. But more than all, he was the true inspirer of Gokhale. Politics in those days was somewhat different from the politics of today. In those days the first sod had to be turned, the roads had to be formed. The bits of granites were sharp and numerous. The cementing was not there. Rhetoric alone did not carry the work ahead of the people. People had to learn and study books on Political Economy and History. Mass appeals were not known in those days. Public meetings then would be regarded as the mass meetings of today in an aggravated form. We, in those days, counted ourselves singularly fortunate if we had an audience of fifty. And to those audiences we displayed our powers of the English language, the careful accent and modulation of the tongue, dexterous extracts and quotations from Burke, Morley and other worthies. I am speaking of my generation. The earlier generation might have suffered from an extra dose of that fervour.

But having said all that on the debit side, let me now count up the reckoning on the credit side. Speaking to such audiences, we could not summon up slogans and be satisfied. We could not use any particular word like 'Pakistan' or 'Inquilab Zindabad' or something of the kind and sit down, feeling perfectly satisfied in our mind that we had started a train which would load and fire the gun powder at the end of it. We had really to make ourselves a little encyclopaedic. We had not much following but we had to convince ourselves. We had to prepare carefully and speak to small but critical audiences. In the democracy of the future, we have to depend upon moving great masses. Men could not, in those far-off days, be moved by epigrams or slogans,

however brilliant. Politics in those days did not enjoy that advantage. People had to be convinced through the mind and then came conviction to the heart. Of course, it was then not the politics of "democracy." But who, even now, is really a democrat? If anybody says that Mr. Churchill or Mr. Roosevelt or Mr. Stalin is a democrat, we know that it is not so.

Beginning, therefore, with Mahadev Govind Ranade, going through the names of Lal Mohan Ghose, Anand Mohan Ghose, Surendranath Banerjea, down to our own times, we find there have been great men who quietly and patiently built up Indian politics. This was the groundwork on which successors went in different directions. In that work, Ranade's contribution was superb. Gokhale, the disciple of Ranade, was a typical Parliamentarian, anxious to convince his opponent steadily, reasonably but not willing to give up essentials. Nevertheless he built up a tradition of statesmanship and of politics.

The Chairman has referred to certain burning topics of the times. I am neither a lawyer nor a politician. I am retired and, in many eyes, a discredited politician. Nevertheless I think it would be cowardly on my part if, speaking on this occasion and following Mr. Sastri, I were to omit all mention of a topic which, to my mind, is most important and fundamental for India. I have been asked: "What have I done, what has been my contribution, in regard to those archaeological, ethnological and zoological remnants—the Indian States?". I have been asked why, if the Indian States want a certain amount of autonomy for themselves, I should plead I am not in favour of Pakistan. Let me here and now give an answer. If an Indian State, while asserting its internal autonomy like an equal unit of the India of the future, is not responsive to the wider currents of national politics, and if an Indian State will not work in unison with what may be called All-India poli-

tics, I say that that Indian State does not deserve to live. What Indian States ask now is nothing more or nothing less than what a well-ordered Province needs for itself *vis-a-vis* the Central power. In other words, in what are internal affairs, in the creation and fostering of local industries, agriculture and manufacture, there should be the utmost attention paid to local wants and needs and rights, but all local grievances and wants are but straw and chaff compared to the urgent and compelling need of All-India. If a question arose, and a conflict ensued between smaller local patriotisms and the higher patriotism, the greater demand must be preferred.

Having said that, I think there is another point of view which has not been sufficiently impressed upon the public and that is this. Assuming for a moment that two or three 'Stans' appear in the Madras Presidency, and the same phenomenon were repeated elsewhere, I ask where the common Customs and Tariff policy, the emigration and immigration policy in relation to the world, which is going to be not the less but the more competitive even after this War, would be. People are apt to talk of the immediate urgency of doing something, in order to meet what is to take place the day after tomorrow morning. You may and should plan for it. But there are bound to be many days after the day after tomorrow morning. The real struggle is going to come after the War. Millions and millions of people throughout the world, who are now in war-work, would return. What have we done to provide for them in the way of land, employment and aids to a decent life? There would be competition after the War. Humanity, such as we know it, notwithstanding the various *Avatars* which we believe in, notwithstanding the emergence of Prophets who have signalised themselves throughout the pages of history, has not essentially altered in its fundamental texture. God grant that new spirit may come at the end of this War. Trade and commerce and high

morality have sometimes co-existed. But I have known few instances in which the active pursuit of trade and commerce and industry did not co-exist with all the Ten Commandments. That is going to be the case in the future. Nobody is going to tell Indians that as they have been good boys, as they could divide themselves into 'Stans', they can be assured freedom from the inevitable struggle and competition. How are England and America going to live after the War unless trade with India continues? How is America going to rest content until she makes good her losses? If, after the War, India was to get her rights, India must speak as one Unit and India should be one and indivisible. Promises are there, but performances are more than promises. It is not abstract doctrine. It is the question of hard, detailed, everyday administration. As one with some experience of administrative problems, I may tell you that, without the unity of India at the Centre, not a single problem can be effectively solved. Taking for instance the food problem, assuming that the question was raised as to whether it was expedient to send rice to Ceylon in preference to Travancore and Cochin where the people were starving, how could a much-divided India operate effectively? It was said that my old and dear friend, Sir Baron Jayatilaka, whose persuasiveness I greatly appreciate, put an embargo on export of eggs and vegetable from Travancore to Ceylon. But Travancore was importing a certain quantity of tobacco from Jaffna and put a heavy tariff on that as a sort of retaliatory step. If the Government of India cannot say with one voice to the Ceylon Government what it could do, what it should not and could not do, the problem could not be solved and would not be solved for ever. Supposing, for instance—I am speaking entirely of a fictitious case—wheat or *dhal* was sent to Java rather than to India and India wanted some more wheat, and gold and silver were sold when they may well be

kept in India, supposing copper went to Australia when India needed it; how could we deal with such problems? What could my friend Mr. Jinnah, or Mr. C. Rajagopalachari or Mr. E. V. Ramaswami Naicker or Dr. Ambedkar do if they were representing various units and did not form part of a United Cabinet? It would be impossible to govern, impossible to administer the country satisfactorily, if the slightest encouragement is given to any such disruptive and disintegrating idea as Pakistan.

In all these matters, politics is an unending struggle and it is always a game of the second best. It is true that compromise is of the essence of political transactions, but just fancy a compromise between a husband and a wife, each of whom has transactions with three or four partners. Compromise is impossible excepting as between individuals who are willing to compromise. In the game of politics, India has a great deal to learn. We need a great deal more of organisation, and organisation needs unity of impulse and achievement. In appraising such problems which would arise in the future, we must not also forget those patriots, those path-finders, those light-bearers, who put India on the sure and certain road to self-fulfilment by their study, reflection and research. Politics has altered much now with the entry of Mahatma Gandhi's great and irresistible power of mass-appeal for which Dr. Besant paved the way. Politics in the India of today has taken a more realistic and grimmer turn. We, of the older generation, though we admire and appreciate from a distance, cannot fully enter into the spirit of politics. Do not therefore think that we are not aware of the great world-forces that are operating in India in the march towards the goal; but let not the younger generation forget the immeasurable debt that it owes to elders.

7. DR. ANNIE BESANT*

We are met here today on a very special occasion. We are met here to do honour to and to commemorate the services and life-work of a personage who may be rightly described as one of the most distinguished, if not the greatest, of the adopted children of India. That she was a child of India was her boast. That was her claim, namely, that notwithstanding her white skin, notwithstanding her place of origin, she was in spirit and outlook essentially Indian. It is therefore not inappropriate for me to claim her as one of the greatest of the adopted children of India.

This occasion is also special, for, as it has been pointed out by Mr. Ranganatha Mudaliar, this day marks the completion of fifty years from the day she landed in Tuticorin. An indefatigable public worker who had already made her mark in England, she decided, from the day that she landed in India fifty years ago, to devote her matchless talents to the service of this country.

This is also a special occasion because, ten years after the demise of this great soul—she died on the 20th of September 1933—Madras has at last wiped out the reproach of ingratitude to a great helper and a great champion of India. Since the centre of her work was in Madras, and Adyar was her headquarters, it is indeed right and meet that Madras should honour this Citizen of the World.

And now, my friends, it is my duty and on an occasion like this, it were just and right, to sketch within the time allotted to me by myself and by the audience, the life-story of Dr. Besant, indicating what she stood for, what she meant, what she signified and signifies to

*Speech on the occasion of the unveiling of the statue of Dr. Annie Besant at Madras on 16th November 1943.

us all. Before I embark upon that task, let me repeat two verses which, she has told me more than once, exerted the most profound influence upon herself. The first quotation is from the *Gita*.

योगः कर्मसु कौशलम्।

"True Yoga is efficiency in action." The second great saying which she has stated more than once to be her watch-word and her inspiration is from the *Upanishads*:

अभय हि ब्रह्म भवति ये एवं वेद।

"Fearlessness is the true Brahman." If we analyse the character, the achievements, the life-work of Dr. Besant, we may best style her as the great and dauntless fighter and a great champion who nevertheless made up her mind from the beginning to fight within the law and never without the law. That, it seems to me, was her great lesson, that was one of her fundamental messages, to us. Laws may be corrupt, laws may be wrong, laws may be iniquitous, but the way to proceed about the business of rectifying them was to strive to educate public opinion, to rouse popular conscience, so that the laws may be modified or eradicated. So long as the law remains law, so long as the law stands, notwithstanding all its iniquity and notwithstanding all legitimate grievances which it occasions, she held that it should be obeyed. Dr. Besant was thus the most pacific of the fighters and the most combative of the peacemakers. This, I feel, would be not an inapt description of Dr. Besant.

She stated that she was a re-incarnation of two persons. One of them was Hypatia of Alexandria and the other was Giordano Bruno. Be it remembered that Hypatia was a highly cultured, an extremely evolved being, who lived in the early times of Christianity when Christian virtues were not so much in evidence as the might of the sword. Hypatia was burnt at the stake, and it is perhaps symbolic or emblematic that Giordano

was also burnt at the stake. Throughout her life, Dr. Besant was a fighter,—yes, a wonderful collaborator—yes, a great disciple, but she was more—she comprehended all these in the predominant characteristic of her being, namely, her instinct for martyrdom.

What a life was hers! Let me, in retrospect, take you over some of the outstanding dates in her life, some of the landmarks. Born, as we all know, on the first of October 1847 she married early in 1867 a very orthodox and rigid clergyman, the Rev. Frank Besant. She herself in her early days was an essentially religious and devoted soul. In her wonderful *Autobiography,* she has pictured herself as wrapped up in mysticism, longing to become a "bride of Christ". With this training and background so overpoweringly mystical, she married a matter-of-fact, virtuous, but somewhat humdrum gentleman. It was like mating an eagle to something in a farm-yard. When her faith was lost, it was characteristic of her that she did not camouflage her disillusion. After an epoch-making case in Court where her oratory first became manifest to herself and to others, she emerged from faith into agnosticism, but a passionate and emotional variety of agnosticism.

She came across Charles Bradlaugh, who had all the endowments and many of the ornaments of life except the grace, the gift of religious belief. Charles Bradlaugh was a militant and pugnacious atheist, a fighter under adverse circumstances fighting hard for his belief. He did not mince matters and did not suffer fools gladly. Charles Bradlaugh and Dr. Besant came together and became joint-fighters for many unpopular causes—birth-control, freedom of belief and the combating of slums. Dr. Besant has very often described these qualities of pugnacity and 'never-saying-die,' which may be said to be characteristic of a certain type of British racial make-up and especially of Charles Bradlaugh. They wrote many pamphlets together—she

wrote under the pen-name of "Ajax". Charles Bradlaugh tried to get into Parliament. He succeeded more than once in being elected to Parliament, but as an atheist he would not swear the oath of allegiance on the Bible, and Parliament resolved to eject him. He was a romantic figure and a born orator and leader of men. A London crowd wanted to storm the House of Commons and obtain an entrance for Bradlaugh, but the House of Commons was equally determined not to allow this "infidel" to enter the House. Charles Bradlaugh received hurt from ushers attempting to expel him as he came to claim his right to his seat in the House. The crowd grew restless and threatened to become dangerous, but Dr. Besant and Charles Bradlaugh themselves faced the crowd and quieted it. "Take the crowd back," he said. "If the law is wrong, we must change the law; we cannot disobey it." It is recorded as one of the greatest things done by them that the crowds under the combined efforts of Dr. Besant and Charles Bradlaugh did surge back. Parliament, struck by the incongruity of the situation, later on changed the law. But the lesson had been learned by Dr. Besant that a law should be altered only by legal means, not otherwise.

So their companionship in speech, thought, and action went on and from that time the position of Dr. Besant as an orator was unequivocal and generally conceded. And what an oratory it was! When she first came to India, I confess that most of us attended her lectures not so much for their religious inner vesture but for the outer vesture, namely language. And what a voice! Mr. Gladstone said that her voice and her elocution were the finest things he had known except for Signor Castelar, Prime Minister of Spain at that time. Her voice was audible in every part of a crowded hall, a voice which rumbled like thunder and yet thrilled one with the diapason of its music, a voice that was the vehicle of thoughts winged and dynamic, sometimes dis-

ruptive, sometimes creative. With this voice and this gift of language she did her work in India as few others have done.

After some years of joint work, Charles Bradlaugh and she drifted apart. I have dwelt a little on this aspect of her life, because those few years were perhaps the most formative and characteristic in the life of Charles Bradlaugh and his coadjutor. The time came when Charles Bradlaugh became more conservative, and Dr. Besant entered more and more into socialism and worked with Ramsay Macdonald, the Prime Minister of the day before yesterday and the wreck of yesterday. With Ramsay Macdonald, George Lansbury, Bernard Shaw, the Webbs and the Fabian Society, she worked among the poor and lowly in London. Her emotions were aroused by the sight of oppressed labour and the life of the slums. She led the match-makers' strike. The match-makers were one of the poorest-paid groups of all London workers. She wanted always to fight for the downtrodden. If one reads about England in those days, one finds that everything was painted in magic colours by and for the well-to-do. There was no pessimism except amongst the lowly. In the Clubs one could hear talk that the only basic issues that were important were those of Free Trade and Profit-making. These would solve England's woes for all time. It was said that there was no poverty. But beneath this surface of optimism ran a deep undercurrent of misery and unrest among the labouring people in London, and it was among these people that Dr. Besant worked for many years, along with her friends. She went into Socialism and did her great work amongst the labourers in many places and was also one of the first of the Suffragist leaders.

On a particular day in 1889 she came across Madame Blavatsky, who was, with Colonel Olcott, one of the founders of the Theosophical Society, a Society

with whose working I have a great deal of acquaintance, though I have never been enrolled as a member. Madame Blavatsky was a kind of universal and rugged genius, unconventional to a point but with also a deep religious and mystical outlook. The mystical turn of thought which was always dominant in Dr. Besant, but which had been submerged, now came to flower, and from 1889 to 1893 she read and studied and pondered and ruminated and investigated and came to her conclusions.

She came to India as a champion of India and of the Indian way of life and thought. She came to India in 1893, but before leaving England she wrote a booklet on "England, Afghanistan and India" which people may well read today for its soundness and right outlook.

On arriving in India Dr. Besant made up her mind to rouse the self-respect of Indians in India. Not that similar work had not been attempted *before* her time. Pherozeshah Mehta, Surendranath Banerjea, Gokhale, and Tilak had done a great deal in that direction, and Gandhi *after* her, and perhaps the contribution of Mahatma Gandhi was the greatest in this respect. But at the time that Dr. Besant came here, it was with a somewhat shame-faced countenance that an Indian would wear Indian clothes. Even the turban was barely tolerated. But if a man pretended acquaintance with the English methods of tea-taking and eating and dressing and living, it was considered a point in his favour. It was not considered shameful not to know or speak one's own mother-tongue. The time devoted to its study, or to the learning of Sanskrit, was regarded as largely a waste. A man was so mixed up with his studies in the schools where he had to learn everything in English, that he had no time for shaking himself free of the obsession of the West. The great protagonist that she was, she defended everything good in India. The position was that if cow-dung was used in India, then cow-dung

must be championed, must be championed as a most sanitary way of keeping a house clean. You differ from her way of proceeding but to a people imprisoned in alien ideas and bewitched by the Western standards and models of life, some voice had to come to release them from the dungeons of their own musings and imaginings and from their inferiority-complex. If it could be said of anyone that Indians are enabled by him or her to shed their inferiority-complex and acquire respect and reverence for Indian personality and institutions as such, that credit must go to nobody so much as to Dr. Besant.

Having begun thus, she started work in the educational sphere. I am not going to deal with her work in Benares which culminated in and fructified into that magnificent educational institution, the Benares Hindu University. Many collaborated with her in this work, notably Pandit Malaviya. But she it was that compelled Indians to shed their lethargy and work for a common purpose.

After that, she turned to politics and my only excuse for the narration of a personal episode is the light it throws on her life and character. In the years 1912 and 1913 it fell to my lot to oppose Dr. Besant in relation to a particular matter respecting the guardianship of J. Krishnamurti and his brother. It fell to me to fight Dr. Besant, to fight Mr. Arundale, to fight Mr. B. P. Wadia, to fight Sir Subramania Iyer, and many others, for whom I had great reverence and respect. Naturally, as a lawyer I felt it my duty in cross-examination to suggest things that were resented. I had to suggest hidden depths of iniquity in what might have been a normal affair, but it was characteristic of Mrs. Besant that not one of the epithets I used or extravagances of speech on my part deflected her from her purpose. It was after the conclusion of the case which, with childish vanity, I felt proud of winning, when I was wrapped up in my

success, she said to me: "I think you have fought a clean fight. Will you come and join me to work for India's political uplift?" It was three days after the conclusion of the case.

The history of politics in India until Tilak, Besant, and Mahatma Gandhi came on the scene was the history of Debating Societies in whose chambers met groups of twenty, forty, or sixty people combining together for collaborating over Resolutions academically faultless and essentially just, but so suave, so sweet, so reasonable that nobody bothered about them. "We" think so and so. "We" resolve this and that. "The hall was crammed to the full" with fifty or a hundred or five hundred people. This was the stuff we heard and rejoiced in. To none of us had come the vision of appealing to the masses, of going to the villages, of speaking to the people at large, of making them realize what they could do, and what it was their duty to do, in the future. As a tried political and social worker, Dr. Besant brought into Indian politics for the first time this idea of propaganda and publicity, and of appealing to the masses, of studying group-psychology and crowd-psychology and realizing that good use could be made of this great gift. The awakening of India from a long sleep had to come. It came through Dr. Besant herself, and none of us who have been in political work can forget that Indian life, Indian politics and political agitation, Indian education, would not have been what it is today, the history of India would have been fundamentally different, if Dr. Besant had not come on the scene. Mahatma Gandhi went farther indeed in some directions. Where Dr. Besant's audiences could be numbered in hundreds or a few thousands, Gandhiji's audiences numbered ten thousand, twenty thousand, fifty thousand. His methods were essentially different in spirit from Dr. Besant's methods, but both had the objective of awakening the people at large.

It was between the years 1914 and 1917 that all this happened. There was a stir in the land. There was a reverberation, in the country, of new life. Dr. Besant became President of the Congress in 1917. She was interned and, for a while, was easily the best-beloved popular idol of India. But popularity in politics is easy to acquire; it is quite as easy to lose. By 1918 Mrs. Besant had lost her popularity by reason of her insistence on the need to obey the law and to shun non-co-operation. She could not command audiences or compel attention. It is neither the time nor the occasion to go into the inner life of that particular epoch in Indian history. There it was, but there again Mrs. Besant never for one moment dreamt of being either angry, disappointed, or disgruntled. Through *New India* and the *Commonweal* and on the public lecture platform she fought, day in and day out, against Mr. Gandhi—just as she wrote against the present system of government. She fought for Home Rule. She worked against Non-co-operation. Side by side she incurred the dislike of the authorities and of the masses which she herself had awakened and she became comparatively friendless. I shall not deal with those great struggles which Dr. Besant had with the Madras Government, with a series of cases which laid down the fundamental principles in certain branches of the law but she was always the same silver-tongued orator, the sage counsellor with infinite patience—the fighter and yet the reconciler. I emphasise the word *patience*. Realising that all these set-backs are only temporary, she believed that one must learn to put up with failure, and then to transcend and surmount ill-success. That was the Besant policy.

About the year 1926 she travelled abroad with Mr. J. Krishnamurti and came back to Adyar in 1927. I should like to say a few words of this period of 1928—1933, because I regard those years as specially indicative of her real spirit. Easy it is, if success blesses us, to

display some easy virtues and to prove and demonstrate them. But it is difficult for one living amidst calumny, amidst obloquy, and even, I may say, amidst oblivion, at such a juncture to remain sweet tempered, patient and forgiving, long-suffering, and yet hopeful of the future. As one who came across her very often during these years, I can say that I did not see one bitter expression on her face, nor did I hear from her lips one vengeful word. She often said: "These are times through which India must pass. Having surmounted the present obstacles, she must come to her own. My work is done but others must fulfil it."

Dr. Besant's life, as human life generally is, was an amalgam of success and failure. What was her success? And what was her failure? Her success, to my mind, lay in this—that she organised the people of India. She taught them the virtue, not only of organisation, but of business-like organisation. Politics and Book-keeping seemed to be strangely at variance with each other. Dr. Besant showed them that steady business-like habits and persistence are as essential for politics as for all professions and careers. She made it clear that business is business, and that, even in politics, organisation and attention to detail therefore must be sought for as much as adherence to great ideals. Her second success was the creation of an All-India spirit and the attempt to eliminate those barriers that are threatening us more and more as time goes on. The third success was the inculcation into us of respect for Indian personality and for Indian civilisation. What was her failure? I think her failure was that, notwithstanding her inmost desire, neither the religious harmony and religious unity of India nor India's political salvation was achieved. But if she failed, was it not primarily because we failed her and we failed ourselves? That is for us, not posterity, to answer. I rather think the conclusion will be in favour of her.

And now, having unveiled the statue of Dr. Besant, which will keep alive her memory and remind us of a great career of transcendent talent devoted to the long-continued, exclusive worship and service of Mother India, I ask you to remember to learn a lesson from her life. And let me refer to some verses from Arthur Clough, which were often on her lips.

"Say not, the struggle naught availeth,
The labour and the wounds are vain;
The enemy faints not, nor faileth,
And as things have been they remain."
"And not by eastern windows only
When daylight comes, comes in the light;
In front, the sun climbs slow, how slowly,
But westward, look, the land is bright!"

The work of persons like Dr. Besant is not for a day, is not for a year, is not for a decade. The results of that work are not easy for us to keep alive and to profit by. Whether this battling for the right, battling always within the law, battling without any reserve, has been of avail, time alone will show. But she made us realise the impermanence of failure and the certainty of ultimate success if we remain true to ourselves and our destiny. These were the lessons of her life. May I conclude by quoting from one of her Convention Addresses in 1905 in which she speaks of this hope and this programme? Sri Krishna, before the Kurukshetra battle began, went to Duryodhana and asked him not to begin the fighting and when all other arguments had failed, even unveiled his mystic and all-pervasive form as Ishvara. Duryodhana was not convinced. Speaking of that episode in one of those memorable passages occurring in many of those Convention discourses which lit up the Puranas and the Itihasas with a floodlight, she said:

> The value of effort does not lie in the immediate success, as success may be counted by you

> and me. Efforts directed to noble ends are never lost, but are an ever accumulating force. He knew that right action is not wrought by the wise for the immediate and apparent fruit of action; that right action ought always to be performed, even though inevitable failure waits to meet it, and He well knew that all those efforts of His were forces, energies, necessary to bring about the ultimate result in what is still to us the far-off future.

And she used the following remarkable words:

> Those efforts for peace made by Sri Krishna, frustrated as they seemed to be at the time by the wilfulness of Duryodhana, those efforts are part of the energies that are making for peace universal in the future, when the need for the lessons of war will be over, and the white wings of peace will brood over a world at rest.

The efforts of such selfless workers as Dr. Besant, irrespective of their immediate fruits, are never lost but provide the energies that "are making for peace universal in the future, when the need for the lessons of war will be over."

8. POST-WAR RECONSTRUCTION ON A UNIFIED ALL-INDIA BASIS*

I am very grateful to you for giving me an opportunity to speak on the main matters dealt with in your observations yesterday. I conceive the work and the jurisdiction of this Committee to be both very general and very particular. It would have to be very particular and specific for the reason that there is no point in creating overlapping activities in connection with the various committees set up by the Government of India and by organisations connected with the Government of India. It would have to be general because this General Policy Committee's function I conceive to be that of also reconciling the work of all other committees and trying to harmonise their conclusions so that a practical programme may be arrived at. Let me be a little more detailed. We are all aware of a very important committee that has been constituted with regard to Public Health, presided over by my distinguished friend Sir Joseph Bhore. We are aware also of the Resolutions now arrived at provisionally with regard to the Road Programme. We are equally aware of Mr. Sargent's scheme. Mr. Sargent's Educational scheme involves an ultimate outlay of 500 crores; the Railway Programme and the Road Programme may come to 300 crores; the Public Health Programme may mean 200 or 300 crores. These are all no doubt long-term programmes, but even long-term programmes, conceived in that manner and expressed in terms of such financial commitments, involve the reconciliation of divergent, or not wholly consistent, policies. His Excellency the Viceroy, in a recent speech, indicated a certain order of priority. He suggested that

* Speech at the Meeting of the Reconstruction Committee of the Government of India at New Delhi on 18th January 1944.

the food-problem would be the first in order of priority and one could also gather that he thought that Education might be postponed somewhat, to meet the other and more urgent demands upon the energies and the purses of the people. Whatever these specific priorities may be, this Committee would be discharging its duties most efficiently if it set before itself the task of analysing and of subsequently co-ordinating the work of these several committees and organisations that are functioning today. It is from that point of view and with that objective that I shall permit myself to speak for a while.

The first point that I desire to make is that there is no blinking the fact that, in order adequately to plan either from the Financial or the Exchange or Currency point of view or from any other, it would be absolutely essential to insist upon central planning, central direction based to a large extent on a central directive and stimulus. I am emboldened to emphasise that aspect of the matter, having regard specially to the experience that has been the lot of some of us. Some of those experiences have been painful—experiences tending to show that it is possible to over-accentuate or over-emphasise local needs, local demands, local sentiment, local patriotisms, and local financial and other commitments. I am referring specially to the food-problem. Even now—I am not saying this in a spirit of reproach and I am making my observations in order to be helpful and not to be destructively critical—even now the amount of Central control that is exercised compared with what may be exercised is exiguous, fragmentary and imperfect. Let us take a simple case, and my colleagues will pardon me if I refer to a matter which, in their opinion, I am apt to dwell upon too much, like King Charles' head in Dickens' novel, *David Copperfield*. Take the food-problem in so far as it appertains to the part of the country from which I come. Travancore is at a very end of India and we are getting our

food from the Persian Gulf—barley from the Persian Gulf, rice from Sind, rice and other grains from Bhawalpur, rice from Kashmir, millets from the United Provinces, and a certain amount of foodstuff from Orissa. One would have thought that it would be possible for the Central Government to have so arranged matters, both from the point of view of convenient transport and otherwise, that Kashmir and Bhawalpur send their surpluses to the United Provinces, the United Provinces send their surpluses to the Central Provinces, the Central Provinces to Madras and Madras to Travancore. That has not been done, and I think that has not been done because there is not enough appreciation in the country at large, in the various provincial centres and amongst the people taken as a whole and even in the cases of Governments which are dealing with this matter, of the importance of co-ordinated activity. I leave the food-problem. But before I do so, I shall also point out that it was because of the thorough and long-standing neglect of the coastal shipping facilities of India that today we are reduced to such desperate straits for the purpose of moving food from (let us say) Sind to Bombay, to Cochin and to Travancore. And I take it that similar problems have confronted the Government in various other localities. I am not here speaking to a brief in regard to the food-problem, nor am I endeavouring to get any advantage for my own State in regard to the supply or the movement of food-grains. I am only using that example as a warning and a kind of beacon light for the purpose of warning us and enabling us to guide our progress aright.

My thesis would be that, whatever may be the political destinies of individual units or groups of units in this country—and I am not going to enter into those vexed questions for obvious reasons—whatever the theory of separate or multiple sovereignties might be, whatever the future might disclose in regard to these programmes,

it is essential at least as a short-term policy, until England and India can get the utmost possible benefit from those arrangements which I trust will be beneficial and will be inevitable after the War, it is necessary that the economic policy, the financial policy, the planning policy of India, should be directed from the Centre watchfully, vigilantly and strongly. A statesman many years ago in England said: "We are all socialists now". Is there any doubt that, whether we like it or not, the logic of events is converting us into communists, whether we call ourselves communists or not? I am very strongly opposed to the communistic theory of holding property; I do not hold with the communist philosophy in many matters; but the triumphant manifestation of what State-ownership, State-regulation, State-control of industry, manufacture and planning could do in the U. S. S. R. has, I think, endowed most of us with a communistic outlook or, at all events, an outlook not antagonistic to the communistic philosophy of regimentation of effort under the watchful and anxious guidance of the State. In answer, therefore, to what fell from the Chairman yesterday in the course of the preliminary remarks, I would say that the role of the State in regard to post-war planning is and must be regarded as fundamental and inescapable; in other words, with regard to fiscal policy, the regimentation of capital and of labour and the harmonisation of capital and labour also in relation to such matters as roads, shipping, air-service and other communications, supply of power, manufactures and industries and various other matters, the Centre cannot abdicate its powers and responsibilities. And I am saying it as a person who here represents an Indian State. At another place, the representative of a prominent Indian State expressed an apprehension that there might be some curtailment of the sovereignty and the integrity of the State administration if the Central Government took upon itself too meticulous and too sustained a control

over such things as the supply of electrical power, irrigation and so forth. My answer then was, and my answer now will be, that in the urgent situation in which we are placed today, if an Indian State notwithstanding its heritage of sovereignty is going to be irreconcilable, is going to act not in consonance with but antagonistically to the welfare and the progress of India as a whole, that Indian State or those Indian States do not deserve to exist. This is true not only of Indian States and Provinces. I would, without hesitation, say that it is the part and lot and elementary duty of Indian States, and the part and lot of British India, to work together, to reconcile themselves to the Central control in all All-India policies, apart from local and State policies and governance. Let there be representation of Indian States, if you please; let them have the fullest say as to the formulation of policy; let them have a chance of putting forward their views, but having done so let them agree to a Central control and Central laying down of the policy. I am the more anxious to emphasise this, because, already, I see signs of a fissiparous tendency, signs of dangers resulting from what may be called disintegrated, inharmonious policies. What is happening today? We are all anxious to start heavy industries on a large scale. We are getting to be anxious today, but at the beginning of this War, what was Australia and what was Canada in regard to most matters? Australia and Canada are exporting-nations, exporting munitions. India was in no worse a position than Australia or Canada, but Australia and Canada had a national policy with the result that, in the matter of heavy industries, the world has to import things from Canada and Australia, instead of Canada being a main importing country in regard to chemicals, machinery, aeroplane parts, shipping and many other things. All this has been done in ten years. What is it that has been done in India? Very little indeed. And we have to make up

tremendous lee-way. We cannot afford to stay where we are, and unless large expenditure of capital and the influence which the Government of India can and should exercise for the purpose of getting all facilities for creating heavy industries in this country are decided upon and unless India can talk with a single undivided voice, there will be murderous competition. We shall be nowhere. Many persons think that, after the War, in some mysterious manner everything will be all right and India can begin to industrialize herself. I doubt it. There will be many countries which are ravaged, many countries in which industries will have been completely paralysed, if not eliminated. A cry will arise, just as it arose after the last War was over, a voice that will ask: "How can Czecho-Slovakia, how can Poland, how can Northern Italy and Austria with all the munition factories blown to smithereens, sustain themselves unless their factories are re-established so that those industries might pay for the food that Italy and Poland and Czecho-Slovakia and Austria would need?" And there will have to be many priorities. The imported machinery is already difficult to get. It is getting difficult to obtain articles even for elementary needs. The Member for Supply knows it, as well as I do, that it is extremely difficult to get machinery from any part of the world. We need intensive cultivation, but intensive cultivation needs chemicals and manures, and the Supply Member knows the difficulty of getting machinery for this purpose from other countries. That difficulty is not going to be lessened. It is going to be augmented hundredfold after the War and unless from today the Government of India makes itself an intolerable nuisance to the British Government and the United States Government and insists on industrializing herself, here and now, and from tomorrow, the position of the day-after-tomorrow is going to be a serious one.

A great deal of conjoint effort would be needed in

the matter of irrigation, hydro-electric power and so forth, and there again the function and the duty of the Centre is clear. It was in the year 1925 that a scheme involving the irrigation of the dry parts of Hyderabad, of Mysore and the Madras Presidency was initiated at the instance of one* who tried to do something for irrigation and hydro-electric enterprises during his tenure of office as Member of the Government of Madras. There was another scheme which had been pending—only for 85 years. That was what was called the Mettur Scheme. This irrigation-project involved certain negotiations with Mysore. They took three years and that scheme materialised, but the other matter of the Tungabhadra irrigation-project, in regard to which I attempted to do something in 1925, is still pending and is exactly in the same position today as it was in 1925. That was a scheme for irrigating about a million and a half acres. If that scheme had gone through, if the Centre had functioned effectively and brought Hyderabad, Mysore and Madras together and insisted on treating the scheme as an All-India problem and if the resulting hydro-electric supply had also started, then today instead of being famine areas, Bellary, Cudappa, Kurnool and some parts of Mysore and Hyderabad would have been the granaries in India. The food problem would have been greatly eased. The same problems will arise in the future. Those problems vary profoundly from place to place. Naturally local needs, local aspirations and local finances are unable to confront those problems and to grapple with them. A large part of India wants irrigation, but one part of India—the part from which I come—wants de-irrigation. Our trouble is to get rid of the water: our rainfall is 100 to 200 inches in many parts of the State and never less than 80 inches on an average, and so our problem is

* This refers to Sir C. P. Ramaswami Aiyar himself.

one of reclamation. Just as Holland had to reclaim vast areas of lands, so we have to reclaim our lands from water. We want pumping-sets for that and hydro-electric power. Naturally, it will be very difficult for another Province to realise the particular needs of our State. They cannot understand this problem. It will be necessary, therefore, for the Centre to see where an industry or irrigation or electric scheme should be placed, what the best way is of establishing that industry, how the money that is available should be spent. And after all, it must be realised that Central initiative is required to settle the question of extension of agriculture, the question of settlement of soldiers on new lands, the making available suitable occupations for the returned soldiers, the making available occupations for the under-dog by way of cottage industries spread all over the country, the delimitation of the fields of the cottage industry and heavy-scale industry, the question of location of industries, the prevention of over-lapping of industries so as to prevent what is happening in the case of Universities and educational programmes being repeated in this sphere. Let not every Province, every State, start the same industries and ask for the same kind of machinery. There must be some kind of direction, some kind of planning from somewhere whereby it might be laid down and enforced that such and such a region is apt for one or other kind of activity, or that such and such a region is apt for one kind of industry and not for another. That may even need treading on people's corns. That may require a certain amount of what may be called unpopular programmes, but unless that planning is regarded and carried out in that spirit, the future would be very difficult indeed, because, after all, notwithstanding all this talk of abnormal sterling balances, our resources are limited in relation to our needs.

Today, we are talking, and rightly talking, of the

interdependence of every part of the world upon every other. England tomorrow and the day after will be much less independent than she was before this War. We talk of independence; we talk of Indian independence. England cannot be, and will not be, independent; the United States cannot be, and will not be, independent; Russia cannot be, and will not be, independent. To say that is not to say that what may be called 'political solutions' are to be brushed aside. Without the solution of the political problems, the necessary outlook, the desire, the inclination, the enthusiasm, will not be forthcoming. And enthusiasm is of the essence of planning. But that having been achieved—and we all pray to God that it might be soon done—the work is just starting. The world will emerge into interdependence—political and economic interdependence—of England, America and every other part of the world. That interdependence will involve planning for world-industries, for world-agriculture, for world-economy. If India has to play her part in the future world and if she has to deserve to live, that planning must start now and from this moment and here. She must plan for herself primarily, and then also harmoniously with the rest of the world. This Committee, I trust, will be an instrument for the purpose of those reconciliations, those harmonisations, those integrations and that co-ordinated unified policy, without which planning for the future would be futile and would not give us the results that we are longing for.

9. THE STUDY AND PRACTICE OF LAW IN INDIA*

The task which I had set before myself has been practically discharged by my young friend, with the result that I am like a junior lawyer trying to address a somewhat frowning court after the senior had exhausted the brief. But I have been told that these desperate occasions, when the senior had so exhausted the brief, are the opportunities for the junior; and, I propose, with your leave, my friends, to discharge my task shorn of its original fulness and completeness by the thoroughness of the handling of it by my young friend.

In the first place, my duty on an occasion like this is supposed to be to introduce the lecturer of the day. That task is surely superfluous. But it has been stated that one of the infallible signs of dotage is anecdotage, and, as I am pursuing my path towards that dotage, I propose to halt and make some use of this 'anecdotage.' It was in 1930, in fact on the 31st December 1930, that Sir Maurice Gwyer, Sir Edward Chamier, Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru, Sir Mohamad Shafi, Mr. Mahomad Ali Jinnah and myself signed the document in connection with the Federal Structure Committee of the Indian Round Table Conference. We were sitting on a Committee for the purpose of allocating legislative functions between the Central Legislature and the Provincial Legislatures and for considering the possibility of the congruence between the legislative and judicial activities of the Provinces and the Centre. Then, as now, Sir Maurice Gwyer believed that whatever may happen

* The Presidential Address at a special meeting of the Law College Association, Trivandrum, held on 23rd August 1940.

to India, that unity of law, that unity of effort in the administration of law, is of priceless importance. Whatever the future may hold for India, I trust that there will be no attempt made to destroy the unity which has been produced not merely by the history of India, but by the impact of a great system of jurisprudence upon our own law. The labours since 1930 culminated in the Government of India Act of 1935, of which the architect, from the structural sense, was Sir Maurice Gwyer. And, no better choice could have been made of a person to interpret that law than Sir Maurice who, as all of us who know something of the English Bar know, was one of the leading constitutional lights of the law. I, therefore, introduce him to you with the utmost possible pleasure as a great lawyer, a great constitutional expert, and one who, in addition to the dry and arid technicalities of the law, sees also the human side of life. Sir Maurice Gwyer is also the Vice-Chancellor of the Delhi University, where he is trying very hard to bring it to the standard of the great Universities of which he is a product.

Now, I propose to address a few words to the students of the Law College before asking Sir Maurice Gwyer to perform his duty, his pleasing duty, I trust, of addressing those with whom he is constantly in contact; because, he is a lawyer and loves to be amongst present or potential lawyers.

Speaking to the students of the Law College, I am reminded of one of the most delightful essays of Robert Louis Stevenson, *Apology for Idlers*. There is no personal reference meant. I do not know enough of the actual working of your institution, in the leisure hours and in the college hours, to say that there is any topical advertence, in my reference to the particular essay, to the Trivandrum Law College. In that essay, *Apology for Idlers*, Robert Louis Stevenson, a man of great and pawky humour, and also a man of inimitable style, has

stated that he sometimes attended the Law School, but that he learnt enough from the school to realise that Emphyteusis was not a disease and Stillicide was not a crime. To those who are not acquainted with these terms of Roman Law, I may say that Emphyteusis was a particular kind of tenure in Italy, and that Stillicide has some relation to drainage pipes. And so Robert Louis Stevenson said that, after attending the Law School, after having elucidated these two great truths, namely, that Emphyteusis was not a disease and Stillicide was not a crime, he afterwards learnt in the Engineering School that the spinning of a top was an instance of kinetic stability. Robert Louis Stevenson says that he treasured these fragments of knowledge very dearly indeed; but he felt all the time that it was not the time spent in the Law School and the Engineering School that mattered, but those idle truant moments when he communed with Nature and evolved, from out of those ideals, the ideals which were the governing ideals of his life: the Law School and the Engineering School were after all only preparatory for the great School and the great Court, namely, the World.

To you, law-students, I may say that there is no reason for pessimism notwithstanding the over-crowding, the apparently over-crowded nature of the profession; because, like my young friend, I hold very strongly that, in future, there is great scope for the lawyer if he realises his destiny and pursues his function in the proper manner. The law needs much reform in this country. It needs a careful differentiation of the functions between the junior and the senior lawyer. It needs specialisation. Today there is not enough specialisation in India, and such specialisation will become possible only after you leave the Law College and make of yourselves beacon lights for the spread of legal truths. There is ample scope for you in the future. Take, for instance, Sir Maurice Gwyer's own court. Sometime

or other, there is bound to be, whether you call it a Federal Court or Supreme Court, there is bound to be a central judicial organisation for the purpose of resolving differences which must inevitably arise in any expanding autonomous country, between Provinces and Provinces, Provinces and States, and between States and States. In the resolution of these differences, in the harmonizing of those respective claims put forth by opposing parties, there is a great future for the institution over which Sir Maurice Gwyer presides with such distinction. But that Court, the practice in that Court, does not need so much case-law as just those nuances within oneself and that appreciation of the philosophic aspect of things, which are not usually associated with the dry-as-dust and dull profession of the law. Thus, therefore, in the field of specialisation in specific branches of the law, Constitutional Law, for instance, there is great scope for the lawyer. I am not one who despairs of the future of law or of lawyers. If there is one debt that we owe to Great Britain, it is the great tradition of the Bar, the practice and tradition of the legal profession. Our law was a most wonderful, intricate and settled system. But that particular institution of the English Bar, that comradeship between the Bar and the Bench, inter-relationship between the Bar and the Bench, discipline and freedom which co-exist with the Bar, are the rich heritage of the Anglo-Saxon tradition. That is a debt which we cannot adequately repay. Long after many other institutions of England are forgotten in this country, I trust that this particular ideal of English Law, which is a rare and rich combination of Roman ideas and of the great common law of England, will persist, to the glory and greatness of India and of England. The two, English law and Indian law, are like the *Ganga* and the *Yamuna*, each making her own contribution to make up the sum-total of those ideas which make for the regulation of life, and the discipline which goes with that

regulation. In that work, the Federal Court or its successor, whatever be its name, has an important and paramount part to play. It is my fervent hope and my belief, that to Sir Maurice Gwyer will be given the distinction of being another Marshal who would soften the rigour of the laws, the acerbities of strict construction, by making for the spirit of the law where the letter may kill. That is a great, fundamental task; and, in that task, we all wish him God-speed.

On behalf of the University of Travancore I extend to you, Sir, a warm welcome; and now I request you to address this audience.

10. BOOKS THAT HAVE INFLUENCED ME*

My father who was one of the special disciples of Professor Gopal Rao, a renowned literary connoisseur and teacher, was passionately devoted to English poetry of the Wordsworthian era and during the latter years of his life dedicated himself to the study of philosophy. Under his guidance, I began to devote concentrated attention to English literature, an acquaintance with which, in accordance with the tradition of my younger days, was regarded not only as indispensable but as the peak point of educational ambition. So influential was the European tradition that, by an irony of fate, my earliest studies were directed to the master-pieces of English literature and even later I studied not my mother-tongue but French. My serious, as apart from formal and academic, pre-occupation with Sanskrit and Tamil came much later. In other words, the training that I received was not unlike that which has been described with such detail by John Stuart Mill in his Autobiography—a book that should be in the hands of every parent and of every young man on the threshold of life in order to serve not only as a guide but also as a warning. The poesy and the attitude towards life of Keats and Shelley also exemplified in the earlier lyrical outpourings of Wordsworth were formative influences during my earlier University career but the startling invasion of new ideas heralded by Darwin and Herbert Spencer and their championship of the theory of evolution, brought to the forefront a new approach towards life's problems and necessarily also towards art and literature. My generation bore the full brunt of the impact of the iconoclastic attack on established forms of belief and Darwin, Huxley and Tyndall very rapidly supplanted earlier preceptors and many of us emerged

* Contributed to "The Indian Review" (Madras), March 1947.

as agnostics. The revised version of the life history of the earth and of living species, the evolutionary doctrine as expounded so brilliantly in Sir John Frazer's *Golden Bough* and the transformed point of view in respect of human beliefs and practices broke down many barriers. Much was destroyed and little was built up to take its place. Nevertheless and by way of fierce and natural reaction there was a parallel urge towards romance and mystery and humour side by side with realism. It drove me to the study of Dickens and Thackeray on the one hand and Charles Reade, Dumas, Balzac and Victor Hugo on the other. The humour and the pathos of daily life and the psychology of liberation contended for mastery. The *Pickwick Papers* of Dickens, Thackeray's *Vanity Fair* and *Esmond* and Reade's *Cloister and the Hearth,* Balzac's *Wild Asses Skin, Pere Goriot* and other illustrations of the *Comedia Humaine* stimulated the comprehensive curiosity of those days.

Saturated as I was with the spirit of the English language, it was not difficult for me to appreciate the work of Hazlitt, Oliver Wendell Holmes (the author of the Breakfast Table series) and to savour the delicate and gentle irony of Charles Lamb which has been in a special manner resurrected by the Chinese satirist Lin Yu Tang. The influence of French literature and the re-discovery of French poetical art-forms in the nineties of the last century brought me into intimate contact with what has now proved to be an evanescent phase of English poetical development. This movement was represented by Henley and Lang, Dobson and Watson and other post-Tennysonian rebels against the Victorian way of thinking. Soon, however, the tragic implications of existence came more and more to the forefront even before the last war, and there were produced many books which revealed the discontent with the present ordering of world economy and demonstrated the desire to shatter the world to bits and to remould it according

to the heart's desire. Hardy, Meredith and Fitzgerald's rendering of Omar Khayyam from one point of view and from another the savagely satirical and formless poetry and prose culminating in T. S. Elliot's *Ulysses*, were powerful influences to which I would have wholly succumbed but for the concentrated study which I took up a decade ago of the great sources of Hindu thought and speculation exemplified in the pristine Upanishads and in Sankara. The life and teachings of the greatest man that ever lived, the Lord Buddha, have exercised a profound spell over me and Edwin Arnold's *Light of Asia* led me to the study of Buddhist religious and philosophic thought which has followed a path parallel to Vedantic speculation. The Gita as a synthesis of philosophy came only next in personal preference.

The clinging and poignant search for the absolute, the daring grasp of essentials coupled with passionate devotion towards a personal Godhead which is manifested in Tamil devotional literature was a further corrective; and if I were today asked to summarise my mental adventures amongst the classics, I would, in order of importance, furnish the following list:

The Upanishads, especially the Isa, Katha, Mandukya, Brihadaranyaka, Taittiriya and Swetaswatara. What has captured my allegiance is the type of lesson taught in the dialogue between Yama and Nachiketas regarding the things that are more excellent as well as the basic propositions enunciated and re-emphasised constantly in them that attainment comes not to the weakling nor to the followers of extravagance in life and thought nor to those who follow the path of misdirected or unattainable austerity.

Sankara's works which are an object-lesson in the unfettered freedom of intellectual research, and in the emotional sphere, the work of the great creative artists Keats, Shelley and Wordsworth of the early nineteenth century.

The romantic and realistic romances and novels of Europe commencing with Dickens and Thackeray and Dumas and culminating in Balzac and Flaubert and the Russian Masters.

The passionate out-pourings of devotional ecstacy contained in the work of the medieval Christian mystics and the Tamil saints.

The contributions made by the leaders of psychological freedom and the exponents of clear-eyed mellowness starting with Plato and the neo-Platonists and comprising Spinoza, Darwin, Huxley, Tyndall, Herbert Spencer and Renan (in his *Vie de Jesus*) and culminating in the writings of Sir James Jeans and Eddington which have thrown a new flood of light on the workings of the Universe and have enlarged many mental and spiritual frontiers.

So far, I have referred to the serious side of literature generally; but equal in importance from a personal point of view have been those intellectual treats and puzzles for which Poe, Gaboriau, Wells, Conan Doyle and other Masters of the literature of incident have made themselves responsible. I frankly avow to an absorbing interest in so-called 'thrillers'.

As a reaction from the commonplace and the sombre, I have been greatly fascinated by what may be called the Literature of Nonsense and if I had to spend some months on a desert island, some of the indispensable items in my luggage will be the Operas of Gilbert and Sullivan, books like *Alice in Wonderland* and *Through the Looking Glass* and the rhymes of Edward Lear and his poetical descendants. Although unable to read him in the original, I have been not only attracted but greatly influenced by the Epigrams and verse of Horace; and the works of his literary descendants, Montaigne and Madame de Sevigne have been my constant companions.

The frank and direct approach to problems of life

and of society initiated by Ibsen and Bernard Shaw in their dramas, by Bertrand Russell in his analysis of present day tendencies and developments and by Upton Sinclair in his review of world conditions before and during World War II have afforded me not only instruction but illumination. I should not omit my indebtedness to Landor whose pen-pictures of the noted characters of history contained in *Pericles and Aspasia* and *Imaginary Conversations* have been my constant solace.

If I were compelled to possess only half a dozen books I would perhaps give my choice to a volume of the ten Upanishads, to that masterpiece of verbal felicity and natural description, Kalidasa's *Meghasandesa,* to the matchless epigrams of Bhartrihari and the works of Lamb, and Sainte Beuve and as an additional, *bonne bouche* a pocket edition of Horace.

But then, I should be sorry to be without a few volumes of Dumas and the two parts of the Golden Treasury of Songs and Lyrics.

11. PRACTICAL PHILOSOPHY*

The present is one of those occasions when the world seems to be on tip-toe awaiting the zero-hour, a moment when history may alter its course in the direction of a fundamental change in the ordering of the world's affairs, comparable with the moment when, as the Biblical legend has it, the sun and the moon stood still for the sake of Joshua. There is a shiver of expectation as of a swimmer taking breath before making his dive. It is no wonder that things are in this posture because it must be conceded that the results of the victorious march of Science of which so much was said and dreamt half a century ago and of the expectations that the values of life and of philosophy would be remodelled on strictly scientific and mathematical bases have belied all hopes. The positive sciences and their innumerable applications to practical purposes have, no doubt, annihilated time and distance and familiarised humanity with new labour-saving contrivances. On the other hand, they have incalculably multiplied the means at the disposal of man to molest and to destroy his fellow-man and his works. In the region of philosophy, speculation has made a full circle and through dogmatic belief and half acknowledged doubt and atheism and agnosticism, has arrived, in the writings of Einstein, Jeans and Eddington, at what is hardly distinguishable from pure mysticism. It would not be an exaggeration to say that the regeneration of mankind through scientific achievement is no longer an article of belief and the collapse of material prosperity and of a

* A Broadcast talk on 29th December 1940.

society based on capitalism, financial centralisation and planning for huge correlated industries has become manifest. The War in its progress has wrought material havoc and destroyed old landmarks and centres of busy life and culture; but it has done something even more basic. It has made it impossible for society in the future to be re-shaped on the foundations regarded as impregnable in the Victorian and Edwardian eras. It is difficult to conceive of land or raw material, capital or wealth, being hereafter concentrated, monopolised and used by individuals or groups or for the benefit of a class. Where such capital and wealth have not been utterly destroyed, they will progressively go into the hands of the State and we are almost back again in many lands to society as it was conceived by Hobbes in his *Leviathan*. In some parts of the world steps have already been taken to nationalise industry, capital, labour, finance and the education of the people. Such nationalisation has occurred both under political systems termed *popular* and those which are clearly *oligarchical* or *autocratic* in regime. In short, life has assumed a new tempo and a new significance which would repay investigation. It is not therefore inappropriate to deal with the problem of the scope and outlook of philosophical speculation as it is being transformed under our eyes, not by way of abstract enquiry but as a guide for conduct and as a beacon-light for humanity's progress in the immediate future. This is why I have gladly accepted the kind invitation of the All India Radio to place a few thoughts before the public for their consideration. None of them are new, but some of them may perhaps stimulate enquiry.

If one reviews the past, say of England, and goes no further back than the 18th century, the main characteristic as well as the consolation of the 'gentleman class', as it was then called, was its sense of leisure and its relative contentment. Not for nothing did Austin

Dobson sing:

Doubtless you
With too serene a conscience drew
Your easy breath and slumbered through
The gravest issue
But we, to whom our age allows
Scarce space to wipe our weary brows,
Look down upon your narrow house,
Old friend, and miss you!

On the contrary, at this moment our efforts and the results that we achieve seem to be best summarised by George Meredith when he laments:

Ah, what a dusty answer gets the soul
When, hot for certainties, in this our life!
In tragic hints here see what evermore
Moves dark as yonder midnight ocean's force,
Thundering like ramping hosts of warrior horse,
To throw that faint thin line upon the shore!

In other words, much of what we do and strive for appears to be insignificant, vague and purposeless.

Humanity is, in general, conditioned by its wants. If these remain unsatisfied, people turn impatient. If they are satisfied, people seem to remain unaffected thereby. This probably is the reason why so many competing religions and sects and philosophies are claiming to make an appeal to the understanding and conscience of a troubled generation. The truth of the matter is, however, that the spirit of sect and bigotry is everywhere present and our life and our conversation are hollow and ineffectual. Surface meets surface as Thoreau asserted in his famous essay on *Life Without Principle.* Journalism, the Wireless, the Gramophone and the Cinema symbolise the pace at which things now move which, in turn, has led to the habit of surveying only the headlines of life and to what has been aptly described as the macadamisation of mind, its foundation being broken into fragments for the wheels of present

day civilisation to travel over. What is the remedy? I conceive it to be neither more nor less than a new alertness and wariness and devotion to re-consecrate ourselves to tasks that are appropriate to the dignity and the solidarity of our race. Even the facts of Science may dust the mind by their dryness unless they are effaced each morning, in the language of the American philosopher, and rendered fertile by the dews of fresh and living truth. To achieve this does not involve belief in any dogma or particular creed. It only requires some specific ideals and the discipline to work for, if not to reach them. After much discussion over his own punishment and the possibility of life after death, Socrates is made by Plato to say that we should participate in certain disciplines and virtues in the present life, notwithstanding that one is not assured of the future and its potentialities. In the language of Plato's Phædo: To affirm, indeed, that these things subsist exactly as I have described them, is not the province of a man endued with intellect. But to assert that either these or certain particulars of this kind take place, with respect to our souls and their habitations—since our souls appear to be immortal—this is, I think, becoming, and deserves to be hazarded by him who believes in its reality. It is appropriate that a man should be confident about his soul and should earnestly apply himself to disciplines. This attitude towards life has been a consistent characteristic of the wise man through all the ages even though it is recognised that speculations on things that lie beyond us too often leave the mind, as the wise consort of Pericles is reported to have said, to the lassitude of disappointment. Thinkers have never admitted that the business of philosophy is only to examine and estimate all those things which come within the cognisance of the understanding. In ultimate analysis and having realised to the full the implications and the dangers of the weariness, the fever and the fret

that now oppress our souls and having at the same time divested ourselves of those mysterious terrors and those flattering and pleasant dreams which once warned or lured humanity away from or towards particular courses of conduct, we find it our urgent duty now to rebuild a new edifice of thought and hope in which we may dwell as a refuge from the outer and inner perils of the world.

What are the foundations on which such a structure can be raised? The foremost is this, namely, that no man or class of men has or can have a monopoly of truth or a patent regimen for salvation. 'There are nine and ninety ways,'—sang Kipling, 'of inditing tribal lays: And every single one of them is right.' In other words, the traditions, the heredities, the histories and temperaments of men and races necessarily result in different ways of approach to life's problems and the condition of philosophy and its fruit are alike the recognition of this truth. If the seeker is earnest, the divergences of the paths are immaterial; and India need not be reminded of what the Lord Sri Krishna asserted when he promised that every one who, following his own chosen path, had the same mental urge and underwent the same discipline, would arrive at the same goal, namely, the object of man's eternal quest. The quality of charity and tolerance, the principle of *live and let live*, is, to my mind, the fundamental accompaniment of true philosophy; and the preciousness of this Gospel is emphasised by contemporary history. The lack of it led to the often purposeless cleavages of the Buddhist and the Hindu sects, to the schisms and disputations of Christian churches and groups from the 3rd to the 17th century with their terrible toll of life and knowledge, to the cleavage in the Islamic world and multiplication of dispensations which have done more than any secular war, to destroy the bodies and brutalise the souls of countless generations of men. Though it is too much to assert

with the great writer who said that there was only one Christian and he died on the Cross, there has been very little practice of Christian principles by the nations who led the van in the medieval or the modern world. A similar statement can be made of most formal religions but it can be averred that the one system which has adhered most clearly though, alas, not continuously to this ideal is the Hindu civilisation.

यं शैवाः समुपासते शिव इति ब्रह्मेति वेदान्तिनः
बौद्धा बुद्ध इति प्रमाणपटवः कर्तेति नैयायिकाः ।
अर्हन्नित्यथ जैनशासनरताः कर्मेति मीमांसकाः
सोऽयं नो विदधातु वाञ्छितफलं त्रैलोक्यनाथो हरिः ॥

This poem which only re-iterates the ideal of the *Gita* is not a mere aspiration but has been happily exemplified in India in the treatment of Muslims, Parsis, Jews, Christians and all religious minorities until political currents and cross currents served to muddy the stream of life. In my humble view, the *sine qua non* for a harmonious development of human civilisation is the recapturing of what I may call this characteristic Hindu conception. Not otherwise than by its fullest expansion would there be found any scope for that development of personality and that mutual honour and respect of which a merely political democracy is a shadow and may be a simulacrum. Recent communications to India by some Members of Parliament indeed disclose that the bases of such an arithmetical democracy are now being re-examined.

Granted the existence and practice of this attribute and virtue, we must nevertheless realise that it is the Infinite for which mankind hungers and, as has been admirably expressed by Havelock Ellis, we ride gladly on every little wave that promises to bear us towards it. The expansion or aspiration of the whole soul which,

in some cases, bears the form of philosophy and in others that of formalised religion, has been often a force on the side of cruelty and repression. But it must not be ignored that only in the strength of this expansion or aspiration could men have acted and suffered so much torture as they have done in the service of religion. When I talk of philosophy or religion in this connection, the words are used in no narrow or restrictive sense. The liberation of impulses recognised as religion is often concerned with art and its reaction not only on the creative artist but those who have trained themselves to appreciate its import. Perfect art, whether it be embodied in a poem or picture, a statue or a piece of music, brings us to the presence of the Infinite. Whether we confront temples or pyramids, images or frescoes, marmoreal prose or haunting melody, the effect of mystery and ecstasy is the same. This manifestation of the Infinite took the form of beautiful representations of man and woman in Greek Art. In Europe, generally it took the shape of Gothic and other cathedrals. In India, architecture and symbolic sculpture, daring speculation, and infinitely refined music took us above and beyond ourselves. It is noteworthy that significant art, even when it deals with commonplace subjects as in the Dutch paintings, can bring us close to the edge of the world. But perhaps it is music that has the most specific religious appeal. In the words of a great writer, there is no other art that tells us such forgotten secrets about ourselves. 'Oh, what is this that knows the road I came by?' hymns a poet. It was this realisation of the significance of art that made Keats affirm 'Beauty is truth—Truth beauty: This is all ye know and all ye need to know' on earth. This kinship of the beauty of things with the innate mystery of things is what has resulted in the Song of Solomon and the *Gita Govinda*.

Philosophy at its highest as taught by Sankara, Plato or Kant has a similar appeal. No two philoso-

phies can be alike because no two minds are alike. But the attraction of philosophy is the same as that of a true work of art inasmuch as it is one of the beautiful dwellings which the human soul has erected for itself.

As a next step we come to a state of things in which not the beautiful alone but all things make an appeal to the spirit. The revelation made, for instance, by Walt Whitman, of the essential sacredness of the common man and woman and of human personality is a striking, though not a wholly new Gospel. It is one which the ancient Roman Emperor proclaimed in the words:: 'I do not regard as strange or foreign to myself anything that is human inasmuch as I am human.' It was this vision of humanity and the realisation of the value and glory of each human soul that led to the renunciations of Buddha and of Christ.

A further step is the vision of a universal law, a discovery, in the language of a recent thinker, of the vastness but yet the homeliness of the world. No one perhaps has expressed it in literature more fully than Goethe and Wordsworth and Thoreau in his Essays wherein he has given an apt expression to the truly-religious aspects of the world around us. Having made unique efforts to live close to Nature and be self-sufficient unto himself, Thoreau speaks, for instance, of the song of the American wood thrush that whenever a man hears it, he is young and Nature is in her Spring. Whenever he hears it, he adds, there is a new world and the gates of heaven are not shut. When Wordsworth and Shelley sing of the rainbow and the skylark, the message is the same. The completest evolution however of this philosophic consciousness is evident—from the emotion or the intuition of the union with the world where the limits of the individual seem to vanish and there is hardly an acceptance of an external will or conscience or being. Such a feeling has been differently expressed in various countries and by many seers. The

Chinese philosopher, Laotse, describes it as emptiness, meaning by it the eschewal of all aims that centred on oneself. It is only by doing nothing, he states, that the Kingdom can be made one's own. The Tamil philosopher expresses the same idea in the words:

It is good to be doing nothing.

The Upanishads and the Gita speak of Yoga, namely, the union of the individual with the Supreme. Four great aphorisms are the landmarks of the Hindu philosophy:

महावाक्यानि चत्वारि
विज्ञानं ब्रह्म, अहं ब्रह्मास्मि,
तत्वमसि, अयमात्मा ब्रह्म ।

'The Absolute is wisdom. I am that Absolute. That thou art. The soul is Brahman.' In these four ways is also expressed what the Buddha declared: 'If I know that my own body is not mine and yet the Universe is mine and it is both mine and thine, no peril can happen.' This also is the sense in which the Sufi describes the mystic union of the human bride-groom with the Divine Bride. The same thought occurs to the Roman Emperor: 'Everything is harmonious with me that is harmonious with the Universe.'

If these, then, be the aspects from which the ultimate problems of the Universe can be viewed, what is their relation to the world we live in and its ways? How are we to deal with the inevitable shortcomings and fallings away from the ideal which seem to be inseparable from human existence and effort? The difficulty of philosophy is not so much in its enunciation of principles but in the daily application of those principles to human life and to human conscience. No one has approached this dilemma with deeper insight than that

great visionary and poet, Robert Browning:

Not on the vulgar mass
Called "work," must sentence pass,
Things done, that took the eye and had the price;

O'er which, from level stand,
The low world laid its hand,
Found straight way to its mind, could value in a trice:

But all, the world's coarse thumb
And finger failed to plumb,
So passed in making up the main account:
All instincts immature,
All purposes unsure,
That weighed not as his work, yet swelled the man's amount:

Thoughts hardly to be packed
Into a narrow act,
Fancies that broke through language and escaped:

All, I could never be,
All, men ignored in me,
This, I was worth to God, whose wheel the pitcher shaped.

More definite and more practical than Robert Browning's is the message conveyed and the light shed upon the path in three passages from the *Taittiriya* and the *Svetasvatara Upanishads,* which I freely translate:

१ सत्यान्न प्रमदितव्यं, धर्मान्न प्रमदितव्य,
कुशलान्न प्रमदितव्यं, भूत्यै न प्रमदितव्यं,
स्वाध्यायप्रवचनाभ्यां न प्रमदितव्यंम् ॥

२ सहनाववतु, सहनौ भुनक्तु, सहवीर्यं करवावहै ।
तेजस्विनावधीतमस्तु, मा विद्विषावहै ॥

३ स एकोऽवर्णः बहुधा शक्तियोगात्
वर्णाननेकान् विहितार्थं दधाति ।
विचैति चान्ते विश्वमादौ सदेव
स नो बुद्धया शुभया संयुनक्तु ॥

1. Swerve not from truth, swerve not from Dharma, swerve not from prudence, self-protection and the path of worldly prosperity. Swerve not also from constant reading and teaching.

2. May we be supported and cherished and may we obtain sustenance in comradeship and be full of courage, may our studies be fruitful and may there be no mutual hatred!

3. He who is alone and without distinctions, who nevertheless creates diversities for specific purposes and annihilates them ultimately, He in whom the worlds are absorbed, let Him grant us true discernment.

The aim and end of philosophy is thus seen to be the attainment of true discernment—critical and awake, though fully responsive to the inescapable wonder and the sacred mystery enveloping all things and events, small and great.

These unforgettable exhortations do not ignore the practical aspects of existence but seek, in harmonious combination, the maintenance of a life of thought and of culture and that never-ending quest of what is beyond manifested being, without which true philosophy would be meaningless.

12. AT THE CROSS ROADS*

To a traveller in the uplands, his path often appears to double and return upon itself and, from time to time, as he encounters many tracks that meet and diverge, he is confronted with the problem of selecting one route or another; and having made his choice he, not infrequently, finds that a road which he expected to take him to the heights leads him to the valley below; whereas an alternative route which seemed to point to the depths clambers up to the peak that was the object of his quest. So does it appear to us that we are circumstanced to-day, torn between doubts and difficulties as to the true path in art, in literature, in science, in politics and the philosophy of life, not knowing exactly where to turn and conscious only of a desire to climb but unsure of the path that leads to the goal. At such a period as this, it may not be an unprofitable task to examine where we stand and whither we are tending and which of the various cross roads should be our choice. The complacent satisfaction that characterised thought a few years ago has yielded place, especially after the War, to a questioning of ultimate verities and, to-day, people are less sure than ever of the fundamentals of what used to be called civilisation, of the purpose and the tendency of that civilisation and of the proper means to be pursued to attain to the new life which everyone is seeking to realise. Men are anxiously asking whether what was termed and presumed to be progress has been really worthwhile; and recent events have administered many an electric shock to the facile optimist and torn up many foundations. Let us even take science which was apparently so secure on its pedestal

* Two Lectures delivered at Jaffna in October 1935 under the auspices of the Sir P. Ramanathan Memorial Lectures.

and so conscious of its own complete perfection. The mediaeval man in Europe lived in a universe of whose purpose he was thoroughly convinced. It was regular and orderly. He knew or thought he knew the principles of its construction and its scheme. He was content to quote either the Bible or Aristotle, the latter being the ultimate authority on mundane things, the former covering all regions beyond the reach of reason. The world outside and all the creatures and elements therein were obviously made in order to serve some purpose connected with humanity. Although Leonardo da Vinci, in an eager and restless age, had announced that science was perfect only in so far as it approximated to mathematics, to most of these happy individuals nothing in the world was really capricious because an all-powerful Providence was watching over the fall of each sparrow, and a person would not have been scouted if he maintained that the planets and stars were created to light up this world and perhaps at intervals to produce the 'music of the spheres' which trained intelligences could hear and appreciate. Where are we to-day? The distances, the magnitudes and the problems dealt with by modern astronomy are absolutely beyond the comprehension of our senses. It has been computed that with the most powerful telescope we can see bodies distant from us by 100 million light years, light, as is well known, travelling at the rate of 186,000 miles a second. Confronted with such figures, the human mind is baffled and what is more natural than that, even 15 years ago, scientific men should have concluded that the Universe was infinite in extent? Then came another shock and to-day there is ground for believing that space itself is finite. This conclusion was reached by a process as remarkable as the conclusion itself, namely, by the elimination of the axioms which we all imagined in our youth to be final and indisputable, the axioms of Euclid. A Russian and a Hungarian

scientist some years ago came to the conclusion that Euclid's Geometry was not the sole or indispensable basis of geometrical theory. A particular form of geometry invented by Riemann was found to deal most satisfactorily with the problems of space; and Einstein utilising this Geometry has demonstrated that we live in a space which is not necessarily governed by the laws of Euclid. The theories of Einstein have led to this seeming paradox, that the totality of space is not infinite but finite; but, at the same time, space has no frontiers or boundaries and the Universe is constantly expanding. This is such an astounding idea that it is not easy to grasp it at once. The ancient Hindu seer in the *Purusha Sukta* seems to have had an intuitive perception of it for he describes the soul of the Universe as follows:

सहस्रशीर्षा पुरुषः सहस्राक्षः सहस्रपात् स भूमिं विश्वतो वृत्वा
अत्यतिष्ठद्दशांगुलम् ।

'He, the Purusha, has a thousand heads, a thousand eyes, a thousand feet. He pervades the Universe and yet extends beyond it by 10 inches', meaning by this that He transcends the Universe even in extent. This was accounted childish babble by Macaulay and by the Victorian scientists; but it does not seem to-day to be such nonsense.

In the language of Professor Sullivan, who has written on the limitations of science, the Riemannian geometry that Einstein adopted shows that a three-dimensional space may be governed by the same properties as a two-dimensional spherical space, that is, it can be finite but need not have boundaries. Mathematicians are now convinced that this is the sort of space we live in. Translated into language that can be more easily understood, what is the result of this reasoning? It is that in this space we can proceed on a straight line for ever without meeting any frontiers, but we should find

after going for a sufficient distance that we are back at our starting point. The deductions from this train of thought have been summarised by Sir Arthur Eddington by the statement that the stars and galaxies may be regarded as embedded in the surface of a rubber balloon which is being steadily inflated so that, apart from their individual motions and the effects of ordinary gravitation and attraction, all celestial objects are getting to be further and further apart by reason of the inflation. Whereas, therefore, some millions of years ago, matter was more or less in equilibrium, the Universe had an inherent tendency to expand and, according to the calculations of modern physicists and astronomers, space to-day is not less than ten times what it was originally and is ever increasing. The figures are staggering. Each of what are called spiral nebulæ or island Universes contains enough matter to make many thousands of millions of stars. Over two millions have been observed in the Mount Wilson Observatory and our Sun is one of the stars in one of these nebulæ and still this Universe is expanding; and one can now realise the physical insignificance of men and the earth and at the present moment there is no ground for assuming that ours is the only one of the inhabited planets.

It is difficult to postulate that the production of life as we know it was the object of the evolution of the Universe. It is now taken for granted by advanced scientists that the Universe is wasting or distintegrating steadily. This involves the position that there must have been in time a definite beginning of the Universe, and the old Vedic and Biblical notions are not as absurd as they once sounded. The *Chhandogya* asserts and this assertion seems to receive scientific support:

सदेव सौम्येदमग्र आसीदेकमेवाद्वितीयम् । तद्धैक आहुरसदेवेदमग्र आसीदेकमेवाद्वितीयं तस्मादसतः सज्जायत ॥

'In the beginning, dear one, there was pure being, one without a second. Some say that in the beginning there was non-being alone, one without a second, and from that *Asat,* the *Sat,* or "being" was born.' But it is at this stage that the whole doctrine of time, as we used to speak of it, needs revision. In the words of one of the keenest of modern mathematicians, Professor Whitehead, at present as we survey the physical cosmos, there is no direct intuition of the counter agency to which it owes its possibility of existence as a wasting and finite organism, and the further theory has been invoked of the constant building-up of matter and the equally constant annihilation of matter. Has there been a far-off perception of this truth in the pregnant opening words of the *Isa* and *Brihadaranyaka* Upanishads?

ओं पूर्णमदः पूर्णमिदं पूर्णात्पूर्णमुदच्यते । पूर्णस्य पूर्णमादाय पूर्णमेवावशिष्यते ।

'Om, *that* is the whole. So is *this* the whole. From whole cometh the whole. Take whole from the whole, yet the whole remains.' Through these researches, the theory of the atom, referred to as ANU in the Upanishads which was gradually developed through the efforts of Robert Boyle and his successors has completely disintegrated along with the atom itself. Substance as such has now ceased to exist; the world which used to be called material and was taken to be composed of something objective, is now seen to consist largely if not wholly of electric charges. As a great scientist puts it, the idea of substance has been replaced by the idea of behaviour. Let us place by the side of this statement the stanza in the Gita, 8th discourse, verse 3:

भूतभावोद्भवकरो विसर्गः कर्मसंज्ञितः

'The emanation that causes the birth of beings is named action [in other words manifested energy]'. We

ask ourselves if the शब्दब्रह्म —the spirit of the Universe—imagined as Logos and as embodied in the vibrations of sound, was a real anticipatory thought. Is vibration and not substance the primordial thing? Light was regarded by Newton as consisting of particles. Then came the refutation of his theory and it was regarded as something immaterial and consisting of waves. To-day, by another reversal, science has proved that light exerts pressure on any object on which it falls. In other words, light behaves like matter although it may not be matter in the ordinary sense. Light like matter is seen to be a mixture of particles and waves. The figures relating to the ultimate elements of matter are as inconceivable as the figures relating to the galaxies. Into the present conception of matter enter electrons consisting of charges of negative electricity and each atom is supposed also to contain a charge of positive electricity-proton sufficient to counter-balance the negative electricity of the electrons, the atom being a kind of shell with an interior compact of disturbance. The diameter of the electron is about one fifty thousandth part of the diameter of the atom. To quote again from Sullivan, 'the material Universe is not the substantial objective thing we had taken it to be, and matter begins to thin away into the completely spectral thing it has now become.'

Nextly, in the case of many, if not all, substances there is a perpetual disintegration going on and one element is being transformed into another. Radium breaking up shoots out the three rays, *L, B, J*, the first being practically helium, the second being electrons and the third being X-rays. No one has discovered why this breaking-up should occur. But it is something analogous to the breaking which is observable in radium, a process that is going on in the stars, and this annihilation of matter seems to account for the radiation of energy in the Universe. The breaking down or the

annihilation of a pinch of salt can produce enough energy to drive a train from one end of the world to the other. How remarkable that some such idea occurred to the philosophers of old, who speak of the efficacy of sound and radiation not only in breaking down matter but in producing energy and reconstructing matter! In fact, this is one of the underlying doctrines of the *Yoga* philosophy and one of the claims made by the *Tantras*, and the Biblical saying: 'In the beginning was the word' is perhaps not mere mysticism.

Another discovery that is revolutionising our ideas is of what is now known as cosmic radiation. There is a very penetrating kind of ray, traversing the atmosphere, which is proved not to come from the earth because it is more energetic at great heights than at sea level. It does not come from the stars or the Sun. It comes from what is called outer space. It is much more powerful than X-rays and the idea is that these rays arise from the annihilation of matter in far-off regions and, if Dr. Millikan is to be believed, they may result in the building up of certain atoms. In other words, they may be evidence either of a *Pralaya* or destruction or creation going on somewhere. What is it that is breaking up and what is the electron? Is it a minute substance? This again is not taken for granted, as the electron is proved to partake of the properties both of a little particle and of waves and is called by scientists a 'wavicle'. It is impossible, in the region of the infinitely small as well as of the infinitely great, to present a picture on 'a working model', in the language of Lord Kelvin. But it is remarkable that Sir Arthur Eddington from whose description of the theory I borrowed the title of this discourse, speculates thus: 'Perhaps in the first stage, only the rudiments of matter existed—protons and electrons traversing the void and the evolution of the elements has progressed simultaneously with the evolution of worlds.' The Gita says

परस्तस्मात्तु भावोऽन्योऽव्यक्तोऽव्यक्तात्सनातनः । यः स सर्वेषु भूतेषु नश्यत्सु न विनश्यति ।

'Therefore, verily, there existeth, higher than the unmanifested, another unmanifested, eternal, which in the destroying of all things is not destroyed.'

Galileo and Kepler and Newton worked on the basis of the three laws of motion. These laws of motion and space and time and matter and the theory of gravitation were amongst the most certain concepts known to us and the Universe was, in the Newtonian system, viewed as matter in motion with space and time factors. The existence of what was called ether was equally one of the fundamental postulates. Einstein has challenged the doctrine of ether, as it was originally expounded, and the theory of *relativity* which is now itself being modified takes us into regions which transcend imagination and lie on the boundaries of the physical and the psychological. He, in fact, asserts that our measures of length and of time are variable. In other words, the measurements of space and time are relative and vary with the motion of the observer. Put simply, although it sounds terribly paradoxical, there is no such thing as the time or the distance between two events. There is nothing in the world but relative motion. To give an illustration, in estimating the speed of a race-horse it is necessary to take account of the fact that when the horse is running, the earth is rotating on its axis, that it is also going round the Sun and the Sun is moving towards the star Vega and that star is rotating with the whole of the galaxy which is moving relatively to the Universe and the Universe itself is expanding.

It was Einstein's achievement that he overcame the difficulties of Infinity by abolishing Infinity and altering his equations so as to make space bend round until it closed. How closely does this curvature, asks Einstein, correspond to the familiar meaning of the word? His

answer is that the correspondence is about as close as in the case of other familiar words such as work, energy, and probability, which have acquired a specialised meaning in science. It is something which we cannot ordinarily conceive of but is found in Nature and is recognisable by certain tests for which a picture is not possible but a name may be necessary. Einstein has, in the challenging book he has just published, *The World as I see it,* summarised his views on space and ether thus: 'Space without ether is inconceivable, for in such a space there would not only be no propagation of light, but no possibility of the existence of scales and clocks and therefore no space-time distances in the physical sense. But this ether is not to be thought of as endowed with properties characteristic of ponderable media, or as composed of particles, the motion of which can be followed nor can the concept of motion be applied to it.' Einstein's views encountered great opposition but there is the admitted fact that there are some discrepancies in the motion of the planet Mercury, which were puzzling astronomers and could only be accounted for by this theory. The proof of the deflection of a star-ray passing near the Sun and the consequent apparent displacement of the star has confirmed the validity of the doctrine.

On these hypotheses, Professor Minkowski has explained all phenomena by asking us to regard time and space as aspects of a more fundamental reality, an entity of four dimensions which the human mind cannot really picture. In his famous Address he states as follows: 'Henceforth space by itself and time by itself are doomed to fade away into mere shadows and only a kind of union of the two has an independent reality.' The ideas of space and time that we entertain are regarded as psychological peculiarities of humanity. What is important is neither space nor time but interval or, in the language of later Geometry, the length in a four-dimensional continuum. This is a very difficult propo-

sition and the result is that the Universe is conceived as much more of a mental creation than ever before. Sir James Jeans says the same thing in so many words: 'The Universe can be best pictured as consisting of pure thought, the thought of what, for want of a wider word, we must describe as a mathematical thinker.' Or, as declared by Professor Levy in his *Universe of Science:* 'The underlying reality of the Universe is never perceived. A mere appearance is experienced so that what the mind pictures is not reality but its superficial structure.' The *Kathopanishad* exclaims:

अस्तीति ब्रुवतोऽन्यत्र कथं तदुपलभ्यते ।

'Save by the statement *That exists,* how is it [the Universe] to be understood?' The *Brihadaranyaka* puts a question and replies thus:

स होवाच यदूर्ध्वं गार्गि दिवो यदवाक् पृथिव्याः यदन्तरा द्यावा पृथिवी

इमे यद्भूतं च भवच्च भविष्यच्चेत्याचक्षत आकाशे तदोतं च प्रोतं चेति

He said: 'Oh, Gargi, what is above the sky, what is below the earth, what is within the earth and the heavens, what is past, present and future and what is woven and interwoven in the ether?'

The answer was:

नान्यदतोऽस्ति द्रष्टृ नान्यदतोऽस्ति श्रोतृ नान्यदतोऽस्ति मन्तृ नान्यदतोऽस्ति विज्ञातृ एतस्मिन्नु खल्वक्षरे गार्गि आकाश ओतश्च प्रोतश्च ।

'There is none that sees but he, none that hears but he, none that minds but he, there is none that knows but he; on this indestructible being, Oh, Gargi, *the ether is verily woven and interwoven.*' In other words, the doctrine that was preached by the *Vedantins* that ob-

jective existence is a variety of illusion and that the Universal mind is the only reality is seen to be a near approach to the truth.

Like matter and electricity, energy itself has been atomised and what is called the Quantum theory is the latest word in science. The researches of the Danish scientist, Niels Bohr, and of Professor Planck have led to what has been described as the greatest revolution in the recent history of thought, namely, that the electron, the ultimate constituent of matter, has properties both of a wave and a particle. That there are particles is shown by their acting on a prepared screen like little bullets. That there are waves can be shown by causing X-rays to pass through crystals and examining the patterns produced on a photographic plate. The waves themselves produce a phenomenon similar to a storm where there are patches of greater and lesser activity. It has been announced that these waves are *immaterial* waves. It is impossible to picture what this signifies; but one of the necessary by-products of the Quantum theory is the amazing deduction that there is no such thing as the course of Nature because when a person observes a phenomenon, he inevitably changes the phenomenon. To put the proposition in another way, if one has to see an electron—if it can be done—light has to be used. In using the light, energy will be used and that energy will disturb the electron and we in this manner arrive at what is now described as the principle of indeterminacy. The uniformity like the objectivity of Nature is seen to be, by no means, unalterable or inevitable.

Having contemplated the system of galaxies and turning to the interior of the atom, we may say that the connecting link seems to be, according to Einstein and Eddington, what is called the cosmical constant. Professor Eddington says in his *Expanding Universe*: 'We have encountered it as the source of a scattering force

swelling the Universe and driving the nebulae far and wide. In the atom we shall find it in a different capacity regulating the scale of the construction of the system of satellite electrons. I believe that this wedding of great and small is the key to the understanding of the behaviour of electrons and protons.' So far is there now a merger of the physical and super-physical in modern thought that Eddington can add: 'It is no contradiction if we say sometimes that the extension of the atom is controlled by the curvature of space and sometimes that it is controlled by forces of interaction proceeding from the rest of the Universe.' It may incidentally be observed that Nature, according to the most modern mathematicians, curiously chooses certain numbers like 137 in her scheme, this number being what has been called the *fine structure constant* in the literature of the Quantum theory. Other curious and persistent figures are 1003 and 1073 (*vide* Eddington's *Expanding Universe*, pp. 73-75).

Leaving the infinitely great and the infinitely small on the one side, we find the scientific account of the origin of the material Universe has itself undergone profound variation. The nebular theory and the idea of evolution were our stand-by in the immediate past and it is curious to recollect how sure I was of their truth and permanence in the year 1899 in the Elphinstone Prize Essay which was composed by me in that year. But as we have seen, the old nebular theory has undergone profound alterations and the doctrine of evolution expounded by Darwin and Wallace has been modified by Weismann and other scientists, and the idea of the Universal struggle for existence and natural selection with a definite striving on the part of the organism is no longer sacrosanct. There are difficulties which require and await explanation, although Mendel has done a great deal to explain the mechanism of heredity. There are more capricious factors entering into

the origin and evolution of species than used to be conceded.

One of the most marvellous developments that have taken place in the study of organisms is the result of experiments in reflex-actions made in recent times by means of researches into the phenomena of hysteria and dreams and hypnotism. It is proved that our minds contain elements which are normally inaccessible to us and a man can be put into a state of hypnotism and made to remember things which took place long ago but which have vanished from his normal memory. One explanation for this phenomenon is that all mental events, like waves of sound, leave tracts or traces in the brain, the matter of which may thereby assume definite forms or arrangements that may be reproduced under certain conditions. The problem of double personality, namely, that of two persons alternately in possession of the same body is another contribution that has been made by the psycho-analysts to whom we owe the doctrine of repressions associated with Freud. Whatever we may think of some of the extreme variations of the Freudian theory which ascribes a love-complex to the nutrition of the infants and an Oedipus-complex to many of our relations with parents and brothers and which carries the interpretation of symbols to unheard of lengths and interweaves inhibitions and repressions into every thought and act, the labours of Freud and Adler and Jung have produced a new philosophy with its own gospel and its own list of remarkable cures and formulae of life. New concepts regarding the growth of ideas and moralities and even of the arts and literature have emerged and it is claimed that psycho-analysis can explain much that is obscure in individual character and human culture and the growth and basis of moral convictions. Its methods are to bring about an escape from the habitual control which is exercised in waking life over words and actions and thus to bring to the sur-

face the working of the unconscious mind that is so active in reveries and dreams. One of its curious results is to lessen the distance between the so-called normal and abnormal and to throw light on many obscure psychological phenomena and their physical reactions. The science is still admittedly incomplete but no longer can be dismissed as a fad. However sceptical we may be, we cannot but recall what marvels we accept in wireless and television and how science has given sanction to telepathy and to recent advances in hypnotism, magnetism and other hidden powers of the mind.

It is not only in the sciences that there has been an upheaval but also in the field of art. The art of the Eastern world is still largely traditional and Indian art in its re-birth is consciously a revival of ancient and mediaeval practice and outlook though it has not disdained help from Europe and Japan and China. But in the Western world, the end of the 19th century and the beginning of the present era saw the rise of the romantic movement in France, whose underlying idea was a revolt against the classics and an attempt to portray passion and movement and the expression of life. 'Who will deliver us from the Greeks and the Romans?' was the watchword; and Corot, Millet and others arose who worked for these aims, and the pictures of Delacroix with their insistence on colour and decoration, especially as demonstrated in his Moroccan scenes, were symptoms of a changing manner. Side by side with this school arose the modern Dutch *genre* which depended on painting with the patience and skill of a miniaturist, some of the productions requiring a magnifying glass for proper appreciation. This is not the occasion for a discourse on the work of men like Maris but there is no escape from the fact that a new school had arisen which tried to invest the most commonplace incidents of farm life with the magic of art

and adopted a new and original style. Simultaneously with these movements came the influence of paintings on silk in China and of Japanese art; and the influence of the Far-East on artists like Whistler cannot be over-estimated. But suddenly, as if with a rush, there burst upon the world—realism and impressionism, and we were faced with the work of men like Manet and Degas with their theory that painting, being an art of sight, ought to concern itself with things seen and that it is mere frivolity to make pictures merely pretty or decorative. There was a rebellion against older artistic authority and some of us remember the storm aroused by Manet's portrait of himself and his wife and his observation that there are no 'lines in nature' and that 'one colour melted into another and that the principal person in a picture is the light.' The conventions of outline were abandoned and, as in some of the Indian frescoes, forms were shaped by a modelling obtained from gradation of tints. A further revolution took place with regard to pigments and the mixing of colours and we have new methods like those evolved by the school of 'luminism' whose idea is to delineate the colour of light with its vibration, Nature not being seen piece by piece but as a whole. In sculpture there was produced the astonishing work of Rodin whose idea was to fashion his subjects not as they existed in anatomy but as they appeared to the human eye. Finally, we approach those new and startling creations denoted by the words post-impressionism, cubism, fauvism and futurism. The idea which was at the back of the old Indian doctrine of sculpture and painting but which had not been encouraged during many centuries in the West was re-enunciated and evolved, although in practice the divergence from the Indian ideal was unimaginably great. According to this theory, painting and sculpture have as a primary function not the representation of Nature so much as the expression of an emotion, the

expression of an idea rather than of appearances. The aim of these schools of art was to reduce phenomena to a minimum, to get rid of trappings and redundancies so as to demonstrate the solidity and the intrinsic shaping of things. The almost obstrusive ugliness of the paintings of Matisse is often compensated for by their expressions of forms and movements, and even distortions of forms are employed wilfully by way of shock tactics. Actuality, according to these artists, is unimportant in Art. Cubism depends on the cutting up of natural objects into geometrical shapes, the idea being not only to demonstrate one aspect of objects but a number of aspects of different standpoints and groupings. In the language of one of their recent exponents, 'these paintings have a special meaning as they are based on the psychological effects of various lines and colours.' Futurism seeks to portray movements by an attempt to imitate the work of the rapid-motion camera. It is an endeavour to convert painting from an art of space into an art of time. The object is not to produce joy or peace, not to soothe but to galvanise the mind. The war brought a new and almost brutal naturalism into existence and new and distinct styles in portraiture and landscape painting are in vogue. Sargent, Augustus John, and Epstein who has succeeded in producing a series of shocks culminating in the famous statue of the Negroid mother and the child, all made vigorous and individual efforts and strove after a new interpretation of Nature and life. Repose and grace and beauty, as formerly understood in architecture; in sculpture or in painting, are certainly not the characteristics of to-day but a multitudinous experimentation—often bizarre, in a variety of forms. As a reader of the modernistic art magazine *Axis* will observe, Cubism itself has been succeeded by other tendencies, calling themselves constructivism and abstract painting and sculpture but all the movements typify a refusal to have any

connection with the object to which the work is ostensibly related. The so-called Abstractionists refuse any suggestion even of natural objects. They create symbols. Just as poetry is giving up meaning and relies on sound values, so this art is supposed to break down the barriers between the conscious and the unconscious. There are many instances of a curious reversion to the methods of primitive and savage art. The ideal of the embodiment of a mood and art is not looked upon as having any relation to life or to any visible phenomena.

It may be said that from the beginning of this century the reaction has been towards simplified contours and a re-orientation of the theory as to the nature and purpose of painting. Art is becoming abstract and non-representational. In architecture, the old and traditional forms of expression were held to be outworn and the idea has become increasingly prevalent that architecture must express directly the purpose of the building. The streamline development of motor cars and æroplanes and the new theory of building are different examples of the same utilitarian idea which was elaborated in America, and of the latter-day claims of architecture that perfect efficiency in a building means perfect beauty. In architecture, as in painting, the so-called 'grand manner' was identified with the posing and insincerity so apparent in the Regency and other periods. We are assured now that 'functionalism' —the complying with practical requirements—is the main test and we arrive at a semblance of the packing case in too many instances. Differences of design are tolerated only when special requirements or climates demand such differences. The modern building and modern furniture specialise in straight lines and rounded corners not solely because of hygienic considerations but as manifestations of a revolt against the merely pretty and the unessential. Although the vast blocks built by the Municipality in Vienna have a beauty

of their own, on the whole, it may be said that modernistic architecture has produced a rigidity and a mechanical appearance that can justly be pronounced to be the mark of a transitional stage which may perhaps lead to something ultimately satisfying in the long run.

It is not easy in a short compass to summarise the dominant ideas or motif of recent European literature but it would be perfectly accurate to say that, as in the instance of the post-impressionist and cubist styles of painting, so likewise in the case of the exponents of the method typified by Joyce's 'Ulysses' and writers of modern *Vers libre* or free verse, which disdains all trammels of rhyme or even normal rhythm, we have desperate efforts to transcend old limitations and the convention of art forms and to manifest in poetry and in prose something more than and different from what literature intended to do in the past. One of the most significant of the new movements is the one heralded by T. S. Elliot in England and Willa Cather in America, who are fiercely rebelling against the value and the validity of all modern experience and the usual forms and standards of expression. Side by side with work which, fortunately for many of us, follows the older and more authentic traditions like Hardy's *Dynasts*, like Bridges' poetry and like some outstanding novels and romances, conscious efforts are being made in the direction of deliberate paradox, and the shock of the unfamiliar initiated by men like Oscar Wilde, Shaw and Chesterton is now emphasised until it becomes painful. Lines of verse cut up in impossible places and ending in the middle of a word, startling and enigmatic utterances, the cult of the repellent, the exhibition of what should be veiled, are some recent features. The theory is preached that the subject is immaterial and what matters is the mood. Words are taken at random and used with little advertence to the object to which they are applied. Not conscious and consecutive thought

but emotional excitement and what is termed 'sur-realism' are the new objectives. Some are trying through the medium of literature to produce the effect of music; something also of the pictorial effect produced on the mind by the feverish activities of today is sought to be translated into literary form. As in modern music, so in literature, it is felt that dissonance and discord are permissible and characteristic modes of self-expression. There is a demand for the abolition of old cadences and it is argued that form must be no longer generic but individual.

If Science and Art are seen to be in a state of dis-equilibrium, what shall we say of the stages through which political ideas have passed and their present characteristics? In the *Shanti* and *Anusasana Parvas* of our Epic, in the *Arthasastra* of Kautilya and in the *Nitisastra* of Kamandakiya, there are records of many systems of government, some democratic like the Buddhist Commonwealths, some oligarchic, most monarchical, and all dependent in their several ways on the ultimate sanction of the customary laws and the ethical *cum* socio-political scheme of life sometimes styled 'Varnashrama Dharma'—which was different from what is known in the controversies of today by that term. All, alike, displayed a certain orderliness and continuity of purpose and objective. Imperialism there was in the Epic times and in days like those of Asoka and Harsha and Chandragupta and in the dreams and achievements of Akbar's days. But these expansions of territorial influence, whether in India or in China, did not alter the fundamentals of life and government, based as they were on small and co-ordinated rural communities, cemented together by a body of potent and comprehensive beliefs and usages and ruled in most matters by autonomous bodies, though now and then supervised by functionaries sent from the seat of authority. It is not possible here and now to deal with the

break-up of this system or with the chequered experiments that took place in this country until the period when there came the impact of the idea of "Government of the people, by the people, for the people" and the consequent assimilation of Western modes of agitation and constitution-building and economic nationalism and planning. In the West, however, the history of its political systems, to an extent not usually realised by many students, is the history of economic maladjustments and their results, as much as it is the story of the successive revolts of the underdogs. Plato in his *Republic*, starting with the position that it is the aim of the individual as well as the State to be wise, brave and temperate, lays down that in the State there are or should be three orders, the guardians, the auxiliaries and the producers, wisdom being the special virtue of the guardians, courage of the auxiliaries and temperance of all. In the State as in man, injustice disturbs all harmony. In essence, the root idea is not very different from that which underlay the caste system as originally ordained in India, although Plato made the State's functions more comprehensive and exacting than was ever the case in the India of former days. From the time of Plato, it has been a favourite pastime to picture ideas of Commonwealths. The inequality of property and its redress and the socialisation of wealth occupied the attention of administrators and theorists from the time of Lycurgus, if one may trust Plutarch. In the city, according to Lycurgus, each man had an allowance and knew his public charge, no man being at liberty to do as he pleased and each man being considered as born not for himself but for his country. In Sir Thomas More's *Utopia* we find it said: 'I must freely own that as long as there is any property and while money is the standard of things, I do not think that a nation can be governed either justly or happily, not justly because the best things will fall to the share of

the worst men nor happily because all the things will be divided amongst a few. Therefore, when I reflect on the good and wise constitution of the Utopians amongst whom things are very well governed and with so few laws, I grow more favourable to Plato and do not wonder that he resolved not to make any laws for such as would not submit to a community of all things.' The interchange of fortunes was one of the fundamental ideas in Utopia and strangely foreshadowed the taxation of the unearned increment and the socialistic and communist theories so rife at present. The speculations of Bacon in *New Atlantis* and of Campanella in the *City of the Sun* alike proceeded on the theory that the State is to be managed for the good of the Commonwealth and not of private individuals and, in the latter treatise, all the children are regarded as appurtenant to the State.

In a very remarkable work which is too little known, *The Commonwealth of Oceana* by Harrington dedicated to Oliver Cromwell, we have the very carefully developed thesis that in most cases the troubles of the world are due not so much to the intemperance of faction and of parties, the misgovernment of kings or the qualities of the people as to changes in the incidence of wealth. In his imaginary Commonwealth, Harrington relied upon safeguards against the shifting of the balance of property and upon a system of popular government in which all offices were to be filled by men chosen by ballot who should hold office for a limited term, thus ensuring a constant flow of new blood through the body politic. This treatise is on one side of the line, while Hobbes' *Leviathan* and Machiavelli's *Prince* are on the other side, the theme of the *Prince* being realism in politics. Machiavelli has been much misunderstood and his name has become a by-word like Kautilya's for stratagem and the defence of arbitrary violence and authority. But, in reality, what Machia-

velli fought for was the formation in every State of a Standing Army of its citizens so as to deprive mercenary soldiers, who were so largely employed in his days, of their functions and powers. His ultimate ideal was the republican but, for the firm establishment of the body politic, he thought that the people could only be welded together by the force of some strong man's will, and as between anarchy and tyranny he was in favour of tyranny. When Machiavelli was charged with having taught tyrants to be strong, he replied that he had also taught the people how they could get rid of tyranny.

It may be noticed that, in the twenty-second Chapter of the *Prince,* it is said that the election of Ministers is of no small importance to a Prince, because the first judgment that is made of him is from the persons he has about him. Machiavelli continues: 'If a Prince who has no judgment of his own consults more than one, their counsels will never agree nor can they have the cunning to unite. Every man will advise according to his own interest or caprice, he not having the parts either to correct or discover it. Men will always prove bad unless by necessity they are compelled to be good'. A very different theory of life and government underlay Rousseau's doctrine of *Social Contract.* Rousseau with the exception of Voltaire is probably the first of the really modern political theorists. He fought for the principle of political obligation and the question that he asked himself was: 'Is the will of the State for each person merely an external will imposing itself upon his own?' He sought to discover how the existence of the State can be reconciled with human freedom and the problem to him was how man, if he is born free, was always in chains. His appeal to a golden age and to the state of Nature is a controversial matter but in so far as Rousseau, founding his system on human freedom, takes man as the basis and regards him as giving himself what laws he pleases and makes the will of the

members of society the main motive power, he is, though restating in a different form Plato's exposition, the protagonist of modern politics. It is to be remembered, however, that the theory of the *Social Contract* elaborated by Rousseau has been used on both sides of every question that has subsequently been raised. It is easy enough to arrive at the doctrine that society is founded on a kind of contract between the people and the Government. This granted, it can be argued on the one side that the people having abandoned themselves to the rulers are bound to submit to them, this argument leading to a semi-theological doctrine involving mutual obligations, which may take the form of the obligation and right of the ruler to govern constitutionally and the obligation of implicit obedience on the other side. The other view, of course, is that society is regarded as based on an agreement between individuals. This was the doctrine enunciated by Milton before the time of Rousseau and this maxim was actually used by the Pilgrim Fathers when they declared: 'We do solemnly and mutually covenant and combine ourselves to come into a civil body politic.' One corollary of this theory is what is usually called the sovereignty of the people and the derivative character of the power of Kings and Magistrates. Instead of regarding Government as a perpetual and all-powerful delegate of the State governing by the right of complete alienation of all power to the Sovereign, as some writers did, Rousseau's doctrine makes the Government depend always on the consent of the governed and regards all rulers as liable to be displaced if they govern badly. For this purpose, therefore, Rousseau postulated an active agreement and not a tacit consent; but this agreement has to be periodically renewed, as was the case in the best days of ancient Greece and modern Switzerland. In modern practice, this theory of democratic Government has led to a state of affairs in which the people

have very little power beyond that of removing its rulers. In fact, Rousseau himself admitted that pure democracy is possible only in small States. In Book III, Chap. 3, he proceeds to affirm that aristocracy is inevitable in medium States and monarchy inevitable in great States. The doctrine of the general will as the application of freedom to political institutions has to meet with the criticism that the freedom of the State as a whole is different from individual freedom and Rousseau has often been blamed as sacrificing the individual to the securing of civil liberty. This is a dilemma facing the political theorist. That most individualistic philosopher, Herbert Spencer, for example, grants that a certain amount of State interference is necessary; but the moment this is admitted, it must be conceded that every case must be decided on its own merits and ultimately the Sovereign becomes omnipotent or subject only to the law of reason. Carefully analysed, therefore, Rousseau's theory is not very consistent with the rights of man as enunciated by the enthusiasts of the French Revolution. It must not be forgotten that Rousseau was driven by his theories to support Aristocracy, although he expressly specified electoral Aristocracy.

After Rousseau and Kant and Montesquieu, we come to Hegel who in his *Philosophy of History* proceeds on the postulates (*a*) that history is on the whole an evolutionary activity and consists of a civilising process, (*b*) that the aim of that process is the attainment of rational freedom and (*c*) that all stable organisations and all religious and political communities are based on principles which are beyond the control of the one or many. To Hegel there need be no special contract; but there are certain primary principles, not mere suggestions of man's weakness but the manifestation in objective form of an infinite reason. He pleaded for self-realisation, a complete development of spirit and freedom in both senses of the term, namely, liberation from

outward control inasmuch as the law to which it submits has its own implicit sanction and emancipation from the inward slavery of our own follies and vices. Hegel sought, as is well known, to analyse the history of the Greek, the Roman and the German States on this basis. In his own language, the history of the world is nothing but the development of the idea of freedom. Objective freedom, again in Hegel's words, demands the subjugation of the mere contingent will. Another essential element is subjective freedom in pursuance of which the will of the individual goes along with the requirements of reasonable laws.

All the politics of the 19th and 20th centuries represent the evolution and interaction of the ideas adumbrated by these great thinkers whose influence extended beyond the realm of ideas into the regions of political practice. Let us consider the existing position of European politics, or rather of world politics, because at present the politics and policies of the world, generally speaking, are either dependent and conditioned on those of Europe or derived from them. The French Revolution and its reactions, the rise of nationalism and the industrial revolution of the middle of the 19th century, ultimately led to the remarkable growth and popularity of Parliamentary Government on the English model, which attained its climax in the epoch of Gladstone and Disraeli. It represented to the world the last word in constitutional perfection and most constitutions in all the continents borrowed their main features partly from the English and partly from the American system which was also derived from England but emphasised the divorce and independent functioning of the Executive, the Judicial and the Legislative jurisdictions. The War of 1914—1918 made serious inroads on the English system and, for the time being, most countries which participated in that Armageddon, including England, under the outward guise of Parlia-

mentarianism, converted themselves into what was in effect a Dictatorship, permanent in some cases, temporary in others. One result of the War and of the regimentation imposed on communities as an economic consequence of the conflict was a renewed and bitter class-struggle transcending the old struggle that dated from 1848. The British Trades Disputes Act of 1927 was very revealing and the use of the injunction by the American Courts after the Labour Dispute in the United States intensified the struggle between the 'haves' and the 'have-nots', between the actual and the would-be communists and the actual and the would-be capitalist members of society. This has become one of the chief phenomena as well as one of the portents of modern society. Institutions which were taken to be sacrosanct are now being challenged, *e.g.*, the Public Schools system in England and its philosophy of life, the present social and economic structure of British society and the whole organisation of business in America. Communities and races, passive in the past, are beginning to challenge the declared mission of Europe and are evincing great anxiety to relieve the white man of his burdens. In some cases like Japan there is a notable combination of spiritual revolt and imitative industrial adaptation and the resultant cut-throat competition. The factory system and the whole industrial philosophy are in the melting pot. The arts of production have advanced to an immense extent but, as strikingly stated by an Econômist, 'the factory workman of today expects nothing of the master but his wages; the manufacturer asks nothing of the workman but his labour.' There is thus very little of real partnership. The doctrine of *laissez faire* and the belief that competition will produce infinite progress have gone by the board. Economic nationalism is getting to be a difficult business, even where the programme is only to foster nascent key industries but it is being attempted

everywhere and not least noticeably in England, the traditional home of free trade. There is the inescapable truth triumphantly, though disastrously, proved by the late War, namely, the fact of the economic interdependence of every part of the world. The free interchange of goods and services is being constantly checked but where such interchange takes place, it is found that different standards of life and differing possibilities of the supply of cheap labour lead to the serious handicapping of the so-called 'advanced industrial people.' Unemployment and distress are aggravated by factors which should lead ordinarily to prosperity. Even success in war has sometimes led to consequences not distinguishable from those of defeat. The final result of the action and re-action of all these forces is that men are beginning to lose faith in the older form of Government and society. Victorian democracy had the advantage of educating the electorate in its day and preventing revolution. But thinkers are beginning to realise that its success was largely due to the then prevalent prosperity and to the absence of any cleavage between the rival parties in the State on fundamental problems. Neither in their social composition nor in their outlook upon individualism was there much difference between the various parties in the State. But even in England the rise of socialism, the abandonment of the *laissez faire* theory, the industrial depression, the strikes culminating in the events of 1926, the delay in schemes of reconstruction, the revelations of the May Report of 1931 which manifested the unsuspected position of the British budget, and the demand for new economies and the admission of large claims made by the unemployed and unemployable—these constituted fresh problems which the old Parties found difficult to solve in terms of old policies or programmes. Democracy, having succeeded in getting rid of old inequalities and privileges, found that a new struggle is imminent wherein new formulae may have to be evolved.

It is felt generally, and the feeling has been care-

fully analysed by contemporary thinkers like Delisle Burns and Bassett and Mr. Harold Laski, in his *Democracy in Crisis*, that there is at present going on an effort to adapt institutions suited to one set of purposes, to conditions in which those purposes cannot freely operate. The effect is necessarily a serious strain and it is universally admitted that the problem has become an urgent one. Reorganisation is essential but none save those who accept the necessity of Dictatorship are clear about the lines upon which reorganisation should proceed. It has been pointed out that an element of difficulty is introduced by the character of the electorate, and by the character of the discussions in Parliament which have changed and which are largely of a specialist nature. Laski in the political sphere and Lord Hewart in the judicial have warned us about the complications that are produced by virtue of the effectual transference of power from Parliament to the Cabinet, and its various agents—the organs of Executive power. In countries like America the history of recent cases has demonstrated that the traditional and unalloyed respect paid to the Supreme Court can no longer be expected as a matter of course; and critics have not been wanting who have echoed what Jefferson stated as early as 1815, namely, that the American Constitution is a mere thing of wax in the hands of the judiciary. Laski argues that though acting wholly in good faith the Supreme Court has operated as a bulwark of capitalism. It is, of course, a fact that lawyers and judges as a profession are generally on the side of the *status quo* and it is equally true, as proved in the case of the Prohibition Law in America and the attempted drives against trusts and gangsters, that no law can be made or enforced when men are not prepared to accept the law or its consequences. Whereas in countries hitherto fortunate like England and America, these various competing and conflicting forces

have, as a matter of compromise and adjustment, been held in comparative control in others there has been a definite revolutionary bias, almost chronic, in large masses of people and there has taken place consequential revolutionary action. Lenin insisted that revolution was an art and advocated the fostering and growth of a revolutionary class. Such a revolutionary mentality has come to stay and has produced one set of results in Russia and another set in Germany and Italy. Competent thinkers are now gravely concerned with the future of capitalism and it is realised that, unless capitalism can produce more general happiness by means of a more thorough equalisation of opportunities and advantages than at present is the case, and unless by a great self-denying ordinance it can pay a stiff price, far stiffer than was demanded by Sir Arthur Salter in his book on *Recovery,* it will not recover its authority. What forms these revolutionary ideas will take in England and America and France it is impossible to say. But it is undeniable that many principles hitherto held sacred are seriously questioned and many postulates denied. The dictatorship of Hitler in Germany may be a function, in the language of mathematics, of defeat and distress and the instinct of self-assertion. The dictatorship of Mussolini, no doubt, is the reaction against the nervelessness of previous political leaders and means the revival of the old Roman belief in the strong man. Kemal Pasha appears to be the aggressive spear-point of a newly emerging national consciousness, which has painfully learnt to exalt the duty of patriotism even above the claims of dogmatic religion. But there is no doubt that the political temper of today throughout the world is in favour of a new equalisation of opportunities in the body politic and a reorganisation of Society for that purpose—a reorganisation which often demands or results in the jettisoning of many ideas as to freedom and liberty which held sway in the past.

The progress of political thought has assumed the form of a spiral. We start with Machiavelli's exaltation of the assertive sovereign who knows his own mind and we arrive by many stages at the era of the glorification of private initiative and unrestricted competition when the State's function was assumed to be mainly negative. Hegel insisted on the power and authority of the State and asked the individual to realise himself not in his own private concerns alone but by his contribution to the life of the State which, to Hegel, was a mystical end in itself. Karl Marx, the ancestor of modern socialistic theories, took hold of Hegel's conception and inverted it. He imagined the State not as based on any unity or solidarity of the community but as a by-product of the present system prevalent in the economic sphere; the deduction made by Marx was that, so long as capitalism continued to exist, there can be no democracy, however much the franchise may be extended. In other words, it is foolish, according to him, to speak of equal political rights when economically there is so much of inequality. Much of the present day democracy is, according to him and his followers, based on economic exploitation. Although his doctrine was enunciated in the Communist Manifesto of 1848, the influence of Marx became most pronounced after the foundation of the first International in 1864 and the Russian Revolution of 1917. At the beginning of the 20th century, there was thus a struggle for existence between the Darwinian theory in politics and the idea, suggested by men like Prince Kropotkin, of co-operation amongst men and the conception of society as an organism. The War and its experiences deflected many of these theories. Various States had to mobilise their national resources and many functional associations had to be used like Associations of Traders and Manufacturers and Trade Unions who, till the Great War, were more or less parties in permanent opposi-

tion. At the end of the War, there could be no return to old conditions, for it had altered both the political and economic configuration of the world.

The most pronounced challenge to all the Governments of the world, since the French Revolution, was issued by Russia and the Communist believed that the cleavage between the old society and the new was inescapable and the new order must be created with new environments by a State wielding limitless authority, which State again is to suffer extinction as soon as its work is done. The Soviet outlook is exactly contrary to the underlying theories of Parliamentary democracy. Its franchise gets rid of the old theory of *one man one vote* and, proceeds on the theory of *one Worker one vote* and in practice, the urban worker dictates the entire policy. In the language of Mr. Cole, it is an avowedly partisan State founded on a class basis, conceived not as the ruling instrument of a finished socialist society but as the instrument of the gradual transition to such a society. This transition cannot take place so long as there is a risk of a counter-revolution and, for the moment, may be said to lie in the distant future, the present being definitely a class rule at whose apex is a rigid and unflinching despotism. Nevertheless, the Communist party has been building up organs of economic administration and systems of planning which are designed to outlive the present class-state. The Five Year Plan of Russia endeavours to enlist the will and the enthusiasm of the proletariat, to work as well as to fight for a new world. It has put a tremendous strain on Russia and is based on a faith in the power of the human will to move mountains, and curiously, the mountain seems to move a bit.

Whilst one challenge to Parliamentarianism is the Russian experiment, Fascism in its several forms is the other. It has been observed that it shares with the Soviet system its insistence on activity as the function

of citizenship and its attempts to exclude all hostile elements and doctrines from the control of the State and its co-ordination of all forms of communal life. But the object set before Fascism is not class-domination but the active stimulation of the national idea, an idea which the League of Nations was created to put into a secondary position in the thoughts of men. At first, Fascism was merely a summons to action but it has slowly built up its own theory of a corporative State, of individuals grouped according to functions, all of them being subordinate to national realisation. With these two challenges in front of it, the Parliamentary system itself is bound to undergo profound modifications suited to the ever-increasing tasks of modern Governments. As was already noted, it works best when there is enough community of view for an incoming Government not to desire to undo the work of its predecessor. This system will be put to a severe strain if there emerges a party which wants to change the basis of society. This is the reason why many men believe that if socialism succeeds in England and America, there must be, at least transitionally, some variant of dictatorship or 'strong' rule such as is being really tried in the United States under Mr. Roosevelt.

Some of the phenomena noticeable in recent British politics are the formation of the British Union of Fascists and the Labour Party's rejection of the theory of Gradualism, the conference of October 1932, in fact, pleading for a complete severance from the methods of the past. It will be noticed that socialist intellectuals like Mr. G. D. H. Cole and Prof. Laski are, in characteristic British fashion, thinking of effecting the contemplated revolution within the four walls of the Constitution. But one of the real perils of the situation is the idea in many minds that capitalist or financial interests will always seek to nullify the policy of Socialist Governments which, it is apprehended by some,

will never be permitted to put into practice their own theories and to fulfil their mission.

Most political theories save the Soviet and Fascist plans depend for their ultimate success on elements of common interest and co-operation between people of different countries and races as well as between different strata in each country and a kind of agreement that violence and war can, under present conditions, never solve any problem, national or international. Indeed, very few problems can escape becoming world-wide on account of the rapidity of intercommunications and the growing economic interdependence of all parts of the earth. Recent events and the conflagration which has now started, however, seem to show that men are not yet too busy to go to wars or to prepare for new wars. The belief that was at one time held in good faith that modern life is too full of varied interest to leave space for primitive fears and suspicions has not yet established itself as a live element in men's thoughts. Politics too and the comity of nations may be said to be at the cross roads.

These lectures, designed to keep alive the memory of one who, in addition to being a fearless advocate of Popular rights and a trained lawyer, was essentially a thinker and systematic philosopher, would be incomplete if there was no reference to modern philosophic developments. If I do not enter into them in detail, it is not solely because of the vastness of the subject and the materials available but because of the tremendous dispersion and range of ideas that is a feature of recent thought in this department. Such ideas have ranged from the materialism and positivism of the middle of the last century to their reaction in the idealism that started with Kant and was developed by later thinkers, from Balfour's defence of philosophic scepticism side by side with his championship of a spiritual point of view to Bergson's endeavour to vindicate the

spiritual character of the Universe and to postulate reality as being neither material nor mental and to urge that the ultimate reality is life. We have realists who maintain the existence of something independent of consciousness. We have James and his pragmatism and his reliance on experience not inconsistent with the acceptance of a superhuman consciousness. There is Earl Russell with his simultaneous rejection of idealism and materialism and there is General Smuts who has striven to reconcile the latest scientific concepts by means of his philosophy of holism. This system deserves special mention because of the General's insistence on creative evolution, which is very distinct from the mechanistic theory. According to Smuts, space and time are no longer homogeneous, but, in his own language, have been reduced to a curved and warped space-time having a definite structure. Matter is conceived of as a system of electric charges. A thing itself is now an event according to the system of relativity and by a synthesis of such thoughts Smuts arrives at the conclusion that life and personality are successive advances in the structure of matter, which is tending towards free and harmonious self-realisation. Recent philosophic tendencies are thus abolishing the estrangement between science and philosophy which was so marked at an earlier epoch. The tendency of modern physics has had a counterpart in the tendency of philosophy to think of reality as a flux of events rather than as substantial. Matter seems to lose its material characteristic and what has been previously stated as the principle of indeterminacy and its applications to free will have profoundly modified old conceptions and altered the reliance on probabilities. In many scientific quarters this symbolism has led to a mysticism which is not very different in its essentials from the Indian thought that is expressed in the formula: तत्त्वमसि ('That thou art') and in the message conveyed in the following passage from the *Briha-*

daranyaka Upanishad:

य आकाशे तिष्ठन्नाकाशादन्तरो यमाकाशो न वेद यस्याकाशः

शरीरं य आकाशमन्तरो यमयत्येष त आत्मान्तर्याम्यमृतः

'He, dwelling in the Akasa, is within the Akasa, whom the Akasa does not know, whose body is the Akasa, who from within rules the Akasa, is thy soul, the Inner Ruler, Immortal'.

Death itself in this view is an event falling outside the inmost nature of spirit and can be assimilated to cosmic repulsion and expansion. On this hypothesis, beings do not pass out of an independently subsisting world, but the world, on the contrary, passes from them and they are lifted above the event. The finite and infinite will then appear in the end to be no longer separable. The Gita announces:

अव्यक्तादीनि भूतानि व्यक्तमध्यानि भारत ।

अव्यक्तनिधनान्येव तत्र का परिदेवना ॥

'Beings are unmanifest in origin, manifest in the midmost stage, unmanifest in dissolution. What ground is there for regret?'

One of the wisest of modern Englishmen, Lord Haldane, to whom, among other things, England owes its new army system and whose manifold services England did not perhaps sufficiently appreciate, has remarked that all accomplishment is only relative and it is not any finality attained that can ever be ours. Adverting to the philosophy of history and regretting that England has not paid adequate attention to India and its thought, he asserts: 'Philosophy has no single form which we can treat as authoritative.' As the teachings of the latest science tell us, creeds and opinions have to be treated with respect but they are for ever symbolic and like all symbols inadequate and often untrue when put forward as expressions of ultimate belief. What we

have to do with philosophy (and this may be said of science and history and art) is, in Haldane's suggestive language, to study it, assimilate it as a criticism displaying an evolution of ideas about what is finally real and to be content with such sense of harmony in our minds as this study brings about.

I have been reading with great interest a very wise and stimulating Address entitled *The Spirit of the East contrasted with the Spirit of the West,* delivered by Sir P. Ramanathan, whose name this institution bears. He was truly of a Catholic spirit and in his religion knew no boundaries or frontiers of race or culture. He analysed industrial progress and its *raison d' etre.* He asked the question *'Cui bono?'* and asserted that the West has yet to learn the real Gospel of work. He spoke of scientific advance and insisted that its value does not lie in the discoveries in the world-plane but in the strengthening and broadening of the mind and so qualifying the mind for research within us. He discussed freedom and its meaning and differentiated outer freedom from freedom of the spirit and he pleaded with Matthew Arnold for the discovery of a clue to some sound order and authority. In his explanation of the Vedanta and Siddhanta as well as in his *Eastern Exposition of St. John* and in his pamphlet on *The Culture of the Soul amongst the Western Nations,* he sought to find that clue and advocated a synthesis of Eastern and Western lore and Biblical exegesis for the purpose of explaining dogmas which, in the words of Cardinal Newman, are always beset with intellectual difficulties. His example is priceless. It is in such a spirit, namely, that of a reverent search for the ultimate, each aspect of which is so full of power and mystery, it is in the spirit of a realisation that the world is at the cross roads and a feeling that an immense responsibility rests on each one of us to make the right choice, that it behoves us to set about the business of thought and life.

13. PALLIVASAL HYDRO-ELECTRIC SCHEME*

I shall, with your leave, occupy some of your time in indicating the policy underlying the Pallivasal scheme, and the general Public Works programme of the Government of Travancore. In order that you may see the picture with its proper background and in due perspective, it will be necessary, perhaps, to take a bird's eye view of the situation as it has developed, and is developing throughout India. Not many weeks ago, there appeared in print a document of great value with which you may agree or from which you may differ, but which it is impossible to ignore—a Memorandum by about ten of the leading industrialists of India, outlining a scheme for the development of industry, of agriculture, of manufacture and of other beneficent projects. In that scheme the authors very rightly lay stress upon the production of power which, in their opinion, should be regarded as the first basic industry in India. This proposition cannot be controverted, because either in the matter of agricultural development along modern lines, or for the purpose of enhancing manufacture and industrial production, or even in the matter of transport, everything depends on the production, utilisation and transmission of cheap power. So much is this the case throughout the world that today we are looking with admiration at the foresight manifested by the Soviet Republic before the War, and Canada after the War, in this matter of electrical enterprise as the foundation of material progress. The Soviet Republic, unknown to many others but pertinaciously and unostentatiously, has built up an industry

* Speech at the Inauguration of the Ramaswami Aiyar Head Works of the Pallivasal Hydro-Electric Scheme at Munnar on 12th February 1944.

and achieved a sum-total of industrial, manufacturing and munitions-production which is astonishing the world today. Such a result could not have been brought about but for very careful forethought and planning. The War began in 1939. Between 1939 and 1944 Canada has done more in the matter of development of industries and of cheap power than any other similar area or population in the world, whereas India has been practically standing still. Let me illustrate this.

According to the scheme to which I have already adverted, namely, the Bombay industrialists' scheme, the potential resources in India of hydro-electric power is 27 million K. W. My good friend, Sir Henry Howard, whose advice this Government has always been glad to avail themselves of, and who today is our Hydro-Electric Adviser, has placed before me a document containing his plans for post-war hydro-electric development. According to him, the power potential of the Bombay industrialists is computed on the excessive side. He reckons that the power potential might be more legitimately and accurately fixed at 8 to 10 million K. W. But whichever be the figure—whether it be 8, 10 or 27 millions—what have *we* developed? Half a million K. W. throughout the whole of India and that, notwithstanding the urgent need of developing our power!

Let me show you another aspect of the matter. Without power, as I have already indicated, neither transport, nor agriculture nor industry and manufacture, can be developed so as to make India the equal of every other progressive country in the world as it deserves to be and, God willing, will be. But without hydro-electric power, can we achieve that destiny? Decidedly not. According to a paper read before the Indian Science Congress by an acknowledged expert on the subject, the life of Indian coal, provided the normal consumption was taken into account and not the speeding up which is essential after the War, is at

the most 200 years.

And the production of high metallurgical coal is expected to continue at high speed only for thirty to fifty years. That means that the coal resources of India are so scanty, so exiguous, that unless we develop electric power, we shall be in a bad way, especially when we consider that the oil resources of India are very limited, excepting a few places here and there in Attock in the North and of course in Burma. Our oil resources are nothing compared with what is needed for the industrial growth of India. From every point of view, therefore, it is wasteful, especially for South India, to run textile mills and other industrial establishments, as they are being run now, with the aid of coal imported from the north of India. We must develop our own hydro-electric resources which are there for easy exploitation, or we fall back in the race. That is the alternative before us.

It was with a full consciousness of these overmastering and inescapable facts that the greatest statesman that India has produced during the last century or two, Sir K. Seshadri Aiyar, when Dewan of Mysore, started the scheme of Hydro-Electric enterprise, helped by a highly qualified and loyal expert, Captain Lotbiniere who was in Kashmir and was brought down to Mysore for the purpose of advising him. The electrification of Mysore was started just as Lenin and Stalin started the electrification in Russia. And if today Mysore occupies the pride of place in India with regard to many-sided industrial developments, and resources adequately organised and regimented, it is due to that very great man and his forethought and prescience. Mysore's example was soon followed in Bombay by the Tatas and by Punjab, but that State was the pioneer. Here, at the risk of seeming irrelevant, let me point out that, as India is run today, no Indian State which does not show a 50 to 100 per cent more progress than a

British administration can justify itself. It is Swaraj in action, and the doctrine is and must be true that personal and benevolent care, personal patriotism, the absence of bureaucracy and red-tape count for a great deal. The rule of India from 5,000 miles or 1,000 miles away can be justified on historical and other similar grounds, but such rule has serious handicaps which are and should be non-existent in an Indian State.

In Madras I was regarded as a kind of electrical fanatic. I do not claim any originality for what has been done there, as I deliberately followed the illustrious example of Sir K. Seshadri Aiyar. A particular scheme was eighty years and more in the chambers of the Secretariat and had never seen the light of day. The Pykara Scheme had been incubating for many years, and never emerged into life. Notes and Minutes from the Secretariat, references to the Government of India, references from the Government of India to the Secretary of State, references back from the Secretary of State to the Government of India, and back again to the Government of Madras, and again to the Superintending Engineer, the Executive Engineer and so on for over thirty-five years—this was the history of the Madras hydro-electric enterprise, and somebody had to make himself a nuisance before the work was started. Thanks to the wonderful and loyal enthusiasm of a band of men like Mr. Hawkins, Mr. Evans and Sir Henry Howard, it was given to me to initiate the Pykara Scheme in Madras and this has made all the difference to the Madras Presidency. But before the Pykara Scheme was started, we thought of and had to abandon, for the time being, the Agency tracts as a possible centre. We then thought of the Papanasam scheme and it would have been started if Messrs. Harvey Bros. had not put in so much money into their thermal plants that they could not help us with regard to the Hydro-electric scheme. Then we came to the Periyar. Acting on behalf of

Madras, I suggested to the Travancore Government that Madras and Travancore should develop the Periyar waters for the purpose of hydro-electric enterprise. The scheme, however, did not materialise.

Now I am again hoping that the same scheme will be taken up and I am here and now making an appeal to H. E. Sir Arthur Hope who rules over the destinies of the Madras Presidency, and to that capable and enthusiastic administrator, Mr. S. V. Ramamurthi who is at present Adviser to the Government of Madras, that they will at least join with the Travancore Government in exploiting the resources of the Periyar waters so that both the Governments, contributing money in equal shares, might develop the power and enjoy it in equal measure. Not otherwise than by complete co-operation between Madras and Travancore do I expect the problem of South India to be solved. Travancore, Mysore, Cochin and Madras will have to work together as one linked-up industrial unit, one power-unit, just as for the purpose of developing the Thungabhadra scheme, Madras, Hyderabad and Mysore have to work as one unit. Having obtained power from Pallivasal and having utilised not only the present sources but sources lower down, we hope that there will still be other sources which can be utilised by the Travancore Government. The maximum output contemplated in the Pallivasal area is, on a ten year plan, 29,000 K. W., turning out annually 200 million units. Having obtained all this energy, what shall we do next? We must, now and betimes, set to survey our geological, industrial and agricultural possibilities and exploit them to the full.

There is one matter which, though nervously in the presence of experts, I may mention. We are too much concentrating in India on huge reservoirs, upon very large head-works and so forth. I would ask my friends, Mr. Bruford and Mr. Menon, to take a lesson from what has been done in France and Switzerland,

where the various stages which a river reaches from time to time are severally utilised for the production of cheap power on a modest scale, and by linking up those sources without incurring expenses for big storage reservoirs, the same result is obtained. The importance of hydro-electric development is now being brought home to us in regard to the solution of the food problem. Without the pumping of water by power, and without the extension of cultivation and irrigation by utilising electrical energy, we should be in an even worse position than we are today. Our food position is bad enough and would be deplorable but for the generosity and the far-seeing beneficence of H. E. the Viceroy and his Government. We are deeply grateful to them for the help which they have extended to us, especially during the last few weeks. I have met Lord Wavell on this matter. He was wholly and entirely sympathetic, and what is more, he is a military man and knows his mind and he will secure the things that he wants to be done without delay and we have definite proofs of that outlook already before us.

Travancore has certain undoubted advantages. We have the advantage of many and variegated natural resources. We have, thanks to the wise educational system initiated fifty years before anybody thought of it in British India, a system of regulated Primary Education. We are today the most highly educated unit in India and that means that education has not been the privilege of the top layer. It has, on the other hand, permeated to the masses, and the result is that labour in Travancore is intelligent as well as comparatively cheap.

In this connection, I might refer to a criticism by one of those newspapers which, for lack of anything more profitable to do, finds it useful to start scares and stir up trouble where there need not be any trouble at all. It says: 'Christians have been living in Travancore

almost from the beginning of the Christian era; now they are making a mass exodus. Hundred and fifty thousand men have already left Travancore for settling elsewhere.' The idea is that, for some mysterious reason, the Travancore Government are forcing the Christians to leave the State. Those who are aware of the actual conditions know how much truth there is in that allegation. True, a certain number of Nairs and a certain number of Christians have gone to seek their fortunes outside the State, but so have Scotsmen. I see from the general response to this remark that there are quite a number of Scotsmen in the audience. They go outside to make their fortunes and, when their fortunes are comfortably made, go back to Scotland. In any case, Scotland is not the worse for it. These men are not going away as a demonstration of the disgust over the mischievousness of Government but they are going to plant new tracts in Malabar and on better terms than in Travancore. How far they are wise is a matter open to doubt. How far, after the War, when rubber and tea find their price level, they will be able to persevere in the exodus, and whether they will not attempt to come back to Travancore are matters open to question, but these are matters for the capitalist, and the labour he is attracting, to decide for themselves. I may, in any case, deliberately give the lie to the statement of the reasons assigned for the exodus which is really on a small scale. As a matter of fact, when I heard about a similar Nair emigration, I sent for the protagonist and asked him how many had gone and he said that four or five families had left. I dare say when I put the same question to the Christian community, I shall get more or less a similar answer.

But, exodus or no exodus, another aspect strikes me and that is this. We have sent to the three fighting forces 53,000 combatant men from Travancore alone. We have sent, to build the roads to Burma, to help in

the conquest of Burma, over 35,000 men. They are our labour corps and I have heard from the highest authority that their work is appreciated as greatly and as fully as the work of the combatant forces. These 100,000 men will be coming back. Are you going to give them the same wages and the same prospects after they have saved this country and saved the world in their own way and to the limit of their possibilities? Are we going to keep them in the same condition as they were before? No. We have to settle them down and give them adequate work to do. We must make it worth their while to recall their years of warfare and realise that the country is grateful to them. How can it be done in an over-populated and under-sized State like this unless intensive agriculture is started? How can we start intensive agriculture, manufacture or industries unless we have the first essential—cheap power? And that is why this Government pays the utmost attention to the development of hydro-electric power.

Now I am going to refer to another topic. I may be misunderstood, but I mean no offence. During the last few weeks, I have been in Delhi, Bangalore, Mysore, Madras and Tanjore. The roads in Madras, in Mysore and Tanjore are now very bad indeed. The time is past when a Dewan of Mysore could say—as he did say once: 'If you want to know where Mysore ends and where British India begins, you shut your eyes, and if your car jolts badly, you have left Mysore.' That time is gone, because of military traffic. Within fifteen or twenty minutes I saw on the stretch of a road from Bangalore to Mysore over fifty military vehicles going along the road—nobody can maintain that road in proper form under these conditions. Mr. Salter* is the mischievous element so far as the roads in this State are concerned. But whatever may be the reason,

* Mr. Salter is the Director of State Transport in Travancore.

I assert that the roads of Travancore are not today a credit to us. I have travelled from Trivandrum to Munnar and there are stretches on that road which are a disgrace to Travancore. There are unfenced bridges and badly repaired roads. I am not going to cast the blame upon any one. The blame is mine. I ought to have travelled more often on these roads and seen things for myself. But I am throwing out a challenge: between now and the 15th of April, I look to the capable Head of the P.W.D., Mr. I. C. Chacko for whose zeal I have great respect, to see that that reproach is wiped off. I go further. I am asking each Executive Engineer, each Assistant Engineer, each supervisor and each overseer to make it his duty to look after some special stretch of road and I, for one, will not hesitate to offer a reward for the best bit of a mile-length of road which comes into existence by the 15th of April. I am not merely casting reproaches. Labour is costlier than before and scantier. We are probably under-manned in some grades, as we are over-manned in others. Many of us are under-paid. These are hard times. There has been scarcity of food. I know all these things, but we cannot keep our motor and transport vehicles in order with the roads in such condition, and without adequate transport facilities all progress must be at a stand-still. I hope that such a state of things will no longer prevail in the State.

It has been very satisfactory indeed to have come here and seen what has been done and the hard work that has been put into this achievement. Obstacles and difficulties and handicaps there have always been and will be, but it is the duty of humanity, as it is the right of humanity, to conquer those obstacles. The conquest of Nature is a thing with which the Engineer has perhaps more to do than anybody else, and I regard the Pallivasal scheme and all the bye-products of that scheme as undoubted conquest over Nature.

Let me thank you for having associated my name with these works and let me trust that what we have today inaugurated will only be the first step in a ladder that leads up to a citadel from which the denizens of future India will cast their eyes to the North and South, East and West, and see a land of plenty and prosperity. Political constitutions, political growth, the ballot-box and all that it means for responsible Government and all that it connotes, are great ideals. But all politics are a means to an end. That end is the happiness of the individual, not the happiness solely of the capitalist, or even of the industrialist or the manufacturer, but the happiness of the common man. The happiness of the common man on the material plane can be attained only by wise industrialisation, variegated, intensive and, extensive agriculture and by all those beneficial activities that go with these efforts. Let us hope that the spectator of the future will be able to say that the men and women of India, aided and helped by the men and women of England, of America, of Russia, of China and of all the great Nations who are fighting for a common cause today, have made India—a land not perhaps for heroes to live in but at least a land for the ordinary man to flourish and prosper in.

14. UNIVERSITY IDEALS IN INDIA—ANCIENT AND MODERN

I*

I understand that this assemblage consists of two categories of persons, the first comprising the members of the Syndicate and Senate and certain others who, as examiners, have been your torturers in the immediate past; the second, those who have survived those tortures and surmounted the inquisition. I have been called upon (owing to the importunity of the Pro-Vice-Chancellor who has developed a very dexterous method of evading his own responsibility) to perform a task which is essentially and intrinsically his. But having been asked to propose the toast of the new graduates, I could not say 'No'. To quote a Latin wit who alluded to his brethren of the pen as afflicted with what he called the *cacoethes scribendi, i.e.*, the itch for writing, I adapted the phrase to myself and perchance, I thought, I had been recognised as one afflicted by the *cacoethes loquendi, i.e.*, the itch for speaking. Working upon that weakness of mine, the Pro-Vice-Chancellor has commanded me to make a long speech, a feat which will be as laborious and irksome to you as it will be a strain on myself (Pro-Vice-Chancellor: *No, No*). These little interruptions, however well-meant, are taken at their intrinsic worth and not at their face-value.

My friends, in speaking to the new graduates of the Travancore University and proposing their toast and bidding them God-speed and wishing them all manner of prosperity in their after-life and their several careers, I bethought myself of what in the olden days were

* Speech at the Law College Hall, Trivandrum, on 29th October 1940, proposing the Toast to the new graduates of the Travancore University.

preached to the denizens of the Forest Universities of ancient India—of the maxims that were inculcated, the ideals that were held up and the pursuits that were proposed to them. And so, as I had received adequate notice of this meeting and the demands to be made upon me, I embarked on some research.

Turning to the *Taittiriya Upanishad* I reflected on one portion of it and thought it as well to extract that portion for the purpose of inspiring ourselves and for achieving the purposes common to all universities—of arming you for the conflicts of various kinds that lie before you in the post-graduate days. Let me be allowed to refer to the passage. Speaking of young men who had finished their arduous apprenticeship and the rigorous training which during many, many years characterised the student's life in ancient India, where the devotee of learning was the Brahmachari, devoted to the service of the teacher in many senses, and where the teacher and the pupil lived not only *in status magistriand pupillari* but as members of a common family conducting common household tasks as well as great tasks of learning and research for their own sake and for the sake of enlightenment, the author holds up for their ideal and maxim:

युवा स्यात् साधुयुवाध्यायकः

आशिष्ठो दृढिष्ठो बलिष्ठः

तस्येयं पृथिवी सर्वा वित्तस्य पुर्णा स्यात् ।

'Let the young man emerging from his pupillary condition be an *Adhyayaka*, a diligent student; let him not only capture but maintain the faculty of constant study and reflection on what he has studied; *Asishtah*, let him be disciplined, let him realise the value of discipline not only as a factor of individual evolution but as a cementing factor of society, as a creative factor; *Driddishtah*, let him be firm of will, resolved of purpose,

so that amidst the troubles and the difficulties of the world he bears an inflexible will, resilient, resistent to all thoughts of weakness and fortified against the folly of yielding to that weakness; *Balishtah,* let him be strong in body.'

Here, I shall, with your permission, pause for a moment. During a long and somewhat chequered career I have seen for myself that the Indian student, whose aim is to benefit by university education, too often loses his health in the process. I have found that amongst men who started alike on the race of life, alike in the quest of their respective ideals, the man whose body was well-disciplined and stood the test scored over the others. Therefore I would ask you, young men, emerging from the portals of this University, to bear in mind the significance of the word *Balishtah.* Too often, in these days, India, Indians, Indian culture, Indian thought, Indian philosophy, Indian art, are characterised as unworldly. Sometimes we are flattered when termed spiritual, spiritual within inverted commas, *spiritual* not as strongly aspiring but *spiritual* with the introspection of the mere dreamer, a symbol of weakness in the affairs of the world. Them the *Taittiriya Upanishad* encourages and warns: इयं पृथ्वी वित्तस्य पूर्णा स्यात्. If you are so disciplined, so firm of will, so strong in body, this world will be full of achievement and wealth for you. By wealth is meant much more than pounds, shillings and pence, or rupees, annas and pies. In order to achieve this result, what did our ancients lay down as guiding principles? Those immortal maxims are and must be familiar to every one who has some knowledge of our ancient scriptures: "Swerve not from truth. Swerve not from Dharma. Swerve not from dexterity in the arts and sciences. Swerve not from prosperity. Do not be other-worldly too early and before your time. Do not turn your face away from the conflicts of this world

and do not be engrossed in vague imaginings and speculation into things which may ignore the problems of tomorrow and the day after. But after achievement, do not forget to teach, do not forget all your life to learn and from these courses do not swerve.'

सत्यान्न प्रमदितव्यं
धर्मान्न प्रमादितव्य
कुशलान्न प्रमदितव्य
भूत्यै न प्रमदितव्यं
स्वाध्यायप्रवचनाभ्यां न प्रमदितव्यम् ।

If you do these, what will be the result? There again our ancients have asserted as follows: 'Your body will be strong and suited to all work; your tongue will be sweet, so that you may persuade and conciliate your fellowmen and carve your way in the world; you will hear good things and always be eager to hear good things.'

शरीरं मे विचक्षणं
जिह्वा मे मधुमत्तमा
कर्णाभ्यां भूरिविश्रुवम् ।

Now, those were the ideals of the 'forest' universities of old. What better ideals, what more ennobling thoughts, could be conceived of than those?

Speaking to you, the university graduates, I would ask you therefore to remember to take care of your bodies first, and then to take care that you do not cease to be students and, lastly and above all, to take care to be firm and resolute in will. Great is the task before us. In this world rewards do not always attend the most deserving. The race is not always to the swift, nor, as the ancient Hebrews said, the battle to the strong. But, whether the battle goes to the strong or

does not, whether the race goes to the swift or does not, what matters is the fighting of the battle, the running of the race, and by the spirit in which you run the race, the spirit in which you fight the battle, you will be judged in this world and in that succession of worlds in which, according to the unfailing law of *karma*, the wrongs of this world will be redressed in God's good time. I am a firm believer in that philosophy. Especially at this juncture when the world is overcast with many calamities and crises, when the problem of unemployment is so great, when the struggle for life is so tense, it is often the young man's lot to turn his back on the struggle and ask why all this education should be imparted and all this expense of spirit. To them I say, however hard and arduous the struggle, remember the prizes are there. The longer I live, the more I realize that however difficult the race is, for the man who runs it there are some prizes, some of them outward and secular, but the biggest prize is the consciousness of having fought the good fight. If the prizes are not the outward prizes, there is the prize of the inward approbation of one's spirit. That ultimate sanction and prize is supreme and is the climax.

Speaking of an epoch not very different from the present, Matthew Arnold sang when the disease he referred to had not spread as much as at present, when the industrial epoch was overtaking England, when the old agricultural system was collapsing, when one system of society was giving place to another:

> 'Before this strange disease of modern life,
> With its sick hurry, its divided aims,
> Its head overtaxed, its palsied hearts, was rife—
> Fly hence, our contact fear!'

Mark the words—'Its head overtaxed, its palsied hearts', that is, ambitions atrophied in despair or in disgust and, what is more crucial, emotions starved or turned to bitterness. The same poet in another great

poem gives the answer. He writes:

'I say, fear not, life still
Leaves human effort scope;
But since life teems with ill,
Nurse no extravagant hope:
Because thou must not dream, thou needst not then
despair.'

With these words I conclude. I bid you all be of good cheer. It is a great world to which the entrance has been given to you. The key is yours. The lock is sometimes rusty and the key does not easily turn in the lock. But in your effort, well-meant effort, spiritualised effort, effort in constant memory of your duty to yourself, to society, to our country whose renaissance you and I and all of us are bound to work for, you will not, and you cannot, you should not, fail. The prize may not be awarded to you today, tomorrow or the day after. But the prize is there. You will reach there in time. Mount the great pinnacles of life. Dream, aspire, achieve, and be not afraid.

With these words I wish you God-speed.

14. UNIVERSITY IDEALS IN INDIA—ANCIENT AND MODERN

II*

At the outset we may well congratulate ourselves on having secured the presence and inspiring advice of Sir Maurice Gwyer, to whom we are deeply indebted for having inaugurated the University Union.

On this occasion it may not be inappropriate to mention that, when I was commissioned by our gracious Maharaja to initiate the University of Travancore, I made bold to lay before him my own ideas on the essentials of an Indian University under modern conditions. The first requisite which I emphasised was that the University's ideal should be that students and under-graduates should emerge from the portals of the institutions with more health and more vigorous personalities than were theirs when they entered. The foremost duty then of this University—a duty which, in my opinion transcends its obligations for the intellectual and psychological development of the students—is the well-designed cultivation of a sound and, to the extent possible, a beautiful body. To attain this end, out-door exercises, organised games, individual exercises—Eastern and Western—are indispensable. The next ideal that I placed before myself and that I have emphasised before His Highness was one familiar to and definitely encouraged by the sages of ancient India and developed in the Forest Universities of old. The same ideal animated the educationalists of Greece amidst the groves of the Academe. The formulation of that ideal in language worthy of it by Cardinal Newman, a great

---

* Address at the Inauguration of the Travancore University Union at Trivandrum on 24th August 1940.

Oxonian, may be relevantly quoted. The atmosphere of the Indian hermitage, the atmosphere of Athens, and the atmosphere of Oxford have all an eclectic charm, which it should be our endeavour to recapture and maintain. Cardinal Newman spoke of the Athenian schools thus: 'I am directing attention not to the mental gifts of Athens which belonged to her nature, but to her method and her instruments. It was the method of influence; it was the absence of rule; it was the action of personality, the intercourse of soul with soul, the play of mind upon mind.' This result was sought to be achieved in the Universities of Paris, and Boulogne, of Oxford and Cambridge, 'by bringing many interests to work together and teaching them to understand each other, to bear with each other, and go on together not so much by rule as by mutual kindly feelings of common devotion.'

Stress, therefore, should not be laid on examinations or on the consumption of midnight oil or on the wastage of midday light. Circulation of thought coupled with concentration on definite intellectual or spiritual pursuits, the encouragement of curiosity—all these co-exist with co-ordinated out-door life, well-furnished messes, the brilliant evening conversational circle—these are our lodestars. Discussions of men, one with the other, exchange of scientific thought and the communication of scientific and intellectual achievement, communication of individual disappointments and triumphs—these are of more value than formal lectures and exercises in the class-room.

Profoundly believing, therefore, that one of the foremost objects of an educational centre is the bringing in of people together with these ends in view, I believe in the importance of Unions like these. It was such advice that it was my privilege to give to His Highness, and I was influenced in the giving of that advice by the fact that I myself had the advantage of

studying in the Presidency College, Madras, during days when Professors did not consider it their duty to be constantly lecturing and giving notes, but believed in the art of leaving students more or less to themselves to wrestle with their own problems. Such a process may have its drawbacks in certain cases, but it certainly develops self-reliance and self-respect and habits of personal individuality. There was the minimum of guidance and provided it is exercised in the right way, such a minimum ought to be enough. Certainly, such a system is better than the strenuous dictation and taking down of notes, morning and evening, repeated from year to year, with no element of strangeness or surprise but analogous to the bullock or the buffalo going round the oil mill creaking with the same discordant sound, day after day and year after year.

The baneful extent to which the habit of over-lecturing can go may be illustrated by an anecdote that I can furnish from my personal experience as a student of law. We had a Professor who lectured on the Negotiable Instruments Act, a competent man but a tired man. There is a book by Willis on Negotiable Instruments. He purchased two copies of the book and pasted those copies in a large-sized note-book and, day in and day out, passages were read out ponderously and uniformly to the delectation of some but to the disgust of many of the students. The habit got on the nerves of a mischievous class-mate of mine who indecorously interrupted the Professor by anticipating him and reading the next sentence to what was being read out in the class. The result was a collapse. Lectures are useful if there is vitality and humour, but their purpose is to stimulate, more than to instruct. Many sufferings of the Indian students and what has been misdescribed as his lack of originality, may be due to the fact that, when the temperature is anything between 90 and 100 degrees outside, a somnolent class is treated

to wearisome dictation of outworn notes. The cramming of those notes became a *sine qua non* to success in the examination, when too often the dictators of those notes were the examiners. This makes for boredom which must lead to lack of spontaneity and flow of thought.

My observations, of course, have no application to the Professors assembled here who, I know, are notable exceptions to the rule I have adverted to. All that I am anxious to point out is that, in any case, after the college hours are over, when the students come into this building, they should be able to obtain wholesome and healthy refreshments suited to their gastronomic preferences, and, after having fulfilled their ambitions and desires in this direction, they should be able to enter upon a banquet, another banquet akin to Plato's, a banquet of controversial discussions and the contact of mind with mind, during which they will enlighten themselves and enlighten their neighbours and thus fulfil the functions of students. Disputation, confutation and discourse amongst young, ardent and aspiring minds who are not departmentalised but who are all anxious to reform and re-mould the world are of the essence of University culture. The satisfactions of a corporate intellectual life are the essentials of a Union, and therefore it is that I welcome the inauguration of this Union, and the inauguration today is a happy augury.

You, Sir, are an illustrious product of the Oxford University. You have adverted to true democracy of the intellect. The curious feature about such intellectual pursuits is that they constitute both an aristocracy and a democracy and in England a corporate life has come into existence where all the refinements, preferences and exclusions of an aristocratic temperament are combined with a democracy of conduct and of behaviour. Such a Union is of the essence of true intel-

lectual distinction. The English people in their Universities have arrived at it, as the French have and the Germans once had. Let our University recapture something of the spirit of such institutions. To do so the essential concomitants are an out-door life, pursuit of healthy out-door games and healthy rivalry in those games, in addition, the devotion to those concentrations which constitute the glory of our ancient system. These combinations, these transmutations of our educational system, require great courage in the face of complicated and difficult problems, and your presence, Sir, is an inspiration to us. I thank you, Sir, for your affability and condescension in coming here to inaugurate the Union.

15. FUNDAMENTALS OF HINDU FAITH*

I proceed to speak on what I conceive to be the foundations of Hindu belief. Wrong conceptions have been engendered and mischievous interpretations have been placed upon certain acts of policy and acts of the State, and in order that there might be no ambiguity or equivocation in regard to these matters, my words must be measured, but I cannot slur over facts on the one hand or over-emphasise them on the other.

How shall I start? It should be, but as things are, it is not too late to underline or to accentuate the meaning and the significance of the Hindu religion or religions and what they stand for. The Hindu faith or religion is composite. It comprises many forms of belief based on several philosophies and is essentially a synthesis of creeds. It relies on many Scriptures and regards some as revealed but it is not the religion of a book or books. It exists and can function apart from and irrespectively of them. It is correlated with many stories, histories, parables, miraculous occurrences and descriptions of various worlds and states of existence and stages of being. But none of these is pivotal in the sense that if they are disproved or controverted the faith falls to the ground. The laws of irrevocable cause and effect and of evolution, the law of the unity of all life and all energy, otherwise termed the doctrines of Karma and Transmigration are the common and underlying features of all varieties of Hinduism. Save the Supreme Self in the ultimate aspect all other Entities from the stone to the star and from the worm to the highest of evolved beings follow and are bound by these

* Speech delivered in the Victoria Jubilee Town Hall, Trivandrum on the occasion of the Temple Entry Proclamation Day, on 12th November 1944.

13

laws and the ultimate Reality which itself is regarded by some as personal and others as impersonal is reached or attained by the shedding of illusions and along the several paths of action, knowledge and devotion, trodden through many lives and forms of life.

The Hindu eschews no faith and no path. He does not condemn any form of spiritual search or attainment. The true Hindu is also a true Christian and a true Muslim and in any case sees no hostility between his creed and the fundamental tenets of those religions. There is no distinction as far as the Hindu outlook is concerned between the validity, the authenticity and the inspirational character of his faith and other great faiths of the world. As in the physical sphere, so in the mental and the psychological spheres, the Hindu habit and intellect and the Hindu spirit have been and will for ever be hospitable. Therefore, it is not in a spirit of paradox or of epigram that I re-assert that to the true Hindu Christianity and Islam are alike worthy of respect and reverence.

What does Islam stand for? I regard, and all thinking men must recognise, Islam as the one and only truly democratic faith that is actually functioning in the world of today. Being a Hindu, firmly entrenched in the Hindu faith, I yet make bold to say so. My own religion has not succeeded, despite its fundamental philosophy, in implementing in practice the oneness of humanity. No other religion, whatever its theory may be, has brought into practice the essential idea of the oneness of man before God and man, as Islam has done. Whether you contemplate a religious observance or the prayers in a mosque or a formal and solemn partaking of food in common, the lowest is equal to the highest in Islam; the beggar in tattered rags gives the call for the prayers, and the Sultan follows. In practical life no other creed except Muhammed's has been the illumination sufficiently in practice—I do not mean to say in

theory—to get rid of the race-complex, the inferiority and superiority complexes, the white, the brown and the black complexes. It is only in Islam that there can be no such problems as those presented by the Boer in South Africa or as those prevalent in white Australia or in the Southern states of the United States of America or even in England amongst several strata of society.

Holding these views I read, with some amusement as well as pain of mind, an editorial in the *Deccan Times* in its issue of the 29th October 1944 asserting that the Travancore Muslims' aspirations are being ruthlessly crushed by the Dewan of Travancore, who is against Pakistan. Pakistan is a political problem, a transitory, an impermanent, and I venture to add, an artificial problem. Therefore many, including myself, have controverted it, but it is a different story with the inner faith and principles of Islam which I hold in great veneration.

The humour of the situation was enhanced by the fact that by the same post as brought me that article, I got the acknowledgment of a donation which I had made in accordance with my usual practice for the benefit of the Nagore Mosque. I do not wish to make further comments.

Some Roman Catholic dignitaries and newspapers have recently started a campaign of ungrounded criticism against the Travancore administration. There are nearly two thousand Christian churches in Travancore and they complain of harshness of policy in not automatically allowing more churches to be built. The policy as to churches is not one of religious intolerance but the actual needs of the situation of which the Government must be the judge, having regard to the feelings and necessities of professors of other religions. It cannot be forgotten that the numerous Christian denominations are by no means agreed, as to the sites of or the necessity for these contemplated churches, and

Hindus and Muslims have also strong opinions on such matters.

A London newspaper called the *Universe* and a Calcutta newspaper named the *Herald,* both being Catholic organs, have made a number of erroneous statements:

> 'The State of Travancore is adopting certain anti-Christian measures.'

That is untruth No. 1, chronicled in the paper called *Universe.* I have, through the appropriate channels asked for an apology from this newspaper and I trust that it will be forthcoming*.

Again that paper says: 'The Travancore Government has, for instance, officially issued as a school text-book *World Religions* in which Christ and Christianity are belittled, if not ridiculed.'

That is untruth No. 2. That book has not been prescribed and was never intended to be prescribed as a text-book. I shall read extracts from that book to show that far from belittling Christianity I have described it as one of the greatest of world religions. As a student of biblical authorities and church history I may claim, after an intensive study of over 40 years, to be entitled to speak with some knowledge. To say that I have indulged in belittling Jesus Christ is a lie.

Again the paper says: 'This book states that the Gospels are not authentic, the Virgin Birth is a myth, and that Christianity is an imita-of Mithraism. Hinduism, on the other hand, is praised.'

I am dealing with these topics later on.

It continues: 'The seventeen elected Christian members of the Legislature, after appealing against inadequate Christian representation in

---

* The paper "Universe" has recently withdrawn these allegations unreservedly.

the public services and against the regulations concerning the building of churches and cemeteries, were asked to resign. On their refusal, the legislature was dissolved by Government order.'

That is untruth No. 3 and untruth No. 4.

'The Muslim and the two powerful Hindu parties have now joined forces to push the Christians out completely in the general elections.'

That is untruth No. 5. The largest single group in the Legislature today is the Christian group.

Not content with stating such things, the *Herald* of Calcutta says that some rules designed for the purpose of expelling Christians from Travancore have been promulgated in order to remove them from the lands which they have cultivated. The truth is as follows: Certain speculators taking advantage of the present high prices of tea and rubber have opened up areas in Wynad and Malabar which were not, till recently, open for cultivation. Proceeding there for cultivating those lands they took along some men with them. It was not Christians alone, not Catholics alone who went there, but Hindus also. Some Hindus as well as Muslims and Christians have gone outside Travancore for other forms of lucrative employment, especially during the period when the food situation was acute in the State and because the wages of labour in many centres of war activity are very high. Nextly, there were persons who were encroaching upon land which was not theirs, sometimes upon land belonging to Government. They were asked to quit. They had never paid rent and were squatters making unlawful gains for years. There is one man who has paid no rent and reaped benefits for nearly thirty years! Such persons were asked to quit. And that is called persecution.

I assert that these theories of persecution are all wrong. And I shall fortify myself by saying that what

I have said about Travancore is open to verification. But I am apprehensive that what is taking place today is part of a wider movement which is designed to derogate a great community.

We are prone to accept certificates from the West and often regard them as conditions precedent to recognising our men and their merits. Tagore's poems in Bengali were not much regarded until he got the Nobel prize, and then he was hailed as the Poet Laureate of India. Sir C. V. Raman was unknown until he was honoured by European Universities and then we found excellence in him. Even at the risk of being accused of indulging in such a habit, in order that I may fortify myself, I desire to quote the testimony of one of the few Westerners, who has a right to pronounce an opinion on Hinduism. Sir Monier Williams, for many decades Boden Professor of Sanskrit in Oxford, describes Hinduism as follows after visiting India three times and having travelled the length and breadth of the Peninsula from Kashmir to Cape Comorin and from Bombay to Tibet.

> 'A characteristic of Hinduism is its receptivity and all-comprehensiveness. It claims to be the one religion of humanity, of human nature, of the entire world. It cares not to oppose the progress of any other system. For it has no difficulty in including all other religions within its all-embracing arms and ever-widening fold.
>
> 'And, in real truth, Hinduism has something to offer which is suited to all minds. Its very strength lies in its infinite adaptability to the infinite diversity of human character and human tendencies. It has its highly spiritual and abstract side suited to the metaphysical philosopher, its practical and concrete side suited to the man of poetic feeling and imagination, its quiescent and contemplative side

suited to the man of peace and lover of seclusion.'

This has been the Hindu outlook and conviction all through the ages. What is the attitude of Hinduism towards the spiritual evolution of humanity, towards other religions and towards its own doctrines? Let me quote to you from the Gita.

> यो यो यां यां तनुं भक्तः
> श्रद्धयार्चितुमिच्छति ।
> तस्य तस्याचलां श्रद्धां
> तामेव विदधाम्यहम् ॥

Let me translate it: 'Whoever follows any faith and worships me under whatever denomination and in whatever form, with steadfastness of purpose and of faith, his steadfastness and his faith shall I recognise and reinforce.'

Such a book and such doctrines may be twaddle and nonsense in the opinion of Dr. Ambedkar but he is an exception. The bulk of Hindus really feel along these lines.

Why should we depart from that precept? That precept has been and will be the guiding principle of the Travancore State, which has welcomed Christians, Muslims and other nationalities, other faiths and civilisations. And, as stated above, Hinduism is not one single doctrine but a compound of many creeds. Its underlying characteristic may best be expressed in these suggestive lines:

> 'Sow a thought and you reap an act;
> Sow an act and you reap a habit;
> Sow a habit and you reap a character;
> Sow a character and you reap a destiny.'

That doctrine of the infinitude of experience and the comprehensiveness and binding character of Karma constitutes the cement, the cohesive element in integrated Hindu thought. Let us analyse the matter with some care. What is the main doctrine or the teaching of the Vedas? Interspersed among the Vedas are the sayings which have been reproduced and expanded later on in the Upanishads and which constitute the foundations of the several Vedanta Schools of thought and philosophy. But by and large, the Vedas may be described as devoted to things ceremonial, sacrificial and hortatory just as the Exodus and Deuteronomy and Leviticus in the Christian Bible are ceremonial and sacrificial—so too are parts of the Quran.

Lord Buddha who was born seven centuries before Christ accepted the hierarchy of Hinduism, he accepted even the pantheon of Hinduism but went beyond it. He denied the efficacy of Vedic ceremonies and sacrifices. He stood for a rigid logical system of self-perfection designed ultimately to dissolve the self in the great Self which he pictured as essentially impersonal. He was termed in his days a *Nastika*, an atheist. So were the Tirthamkaras, and the great Mahavira, the protagonist of Jainism, termed atheists. And yet, today, the Buddha is regarded and venerated as an Avatar and Buddhism has profoundly influenced all later Hindu religious development. So that when we turn to Buddhism and Jainism, we find that what were termed atheistic philosophies have come within the ambit of the Hindu faith. We find in the Sikh doctrine, the Lingayat doctrine and the Bhakti cults including the developments associated with Kabir, Tukaram and the great *Saiva* and *Vaishnava* saints—efflorescences, by-products, off-shoots of the Hindu faith. And the Hindu religion has embraced them all, given them all hospitality, so that a person born in a *Saiva* family like myself has a *Vaishnava* name. And so it goes on. Why should,

therefore, persecution be associated with Hinduism and how can it be regarded as a concomitant of the professing of the Hindu faith? The Sufi doctrine although proceeding from Islam is closely linked with the Hindu line of thought and is equally all-embracing and intrinsically catholic.

A great deal has been said and will be said with reference to another aspect of the matter. It has been stated that Christianity, Catholicism especially, is a militant faith, a converting faith. So is Islam, and therefore, it is argued that anything which prevents the grant of full facility for conversion to Christianity or Islam, should be regarded as improper or sinful and as offending against the law of man and of God. I grant that every human being has the right to exercise his suasive powers, his powers of advocacy to appeal to the highest and best instincts in his fellowmen, to induce them to think and act on the same lines as himself. If a person honestly feels that light came only to Jesus and his apostles and to those that have followed him, it is perfectly open to him to preach the faith that is in him and to induce honest conversion. But if conversion is undertaken as a wholesale mass-movement or is based upon the hope or possibility of temporal advantages or is done merely to procure or manufacture statistics favourable to a particular community, such a form of conversion would be opposed and has been opposed by every great Christian writer or thinker. Conversion, therefore, is perfectly legitimate provided it proceeds from fundamental convictions, or in the language of the Christian fathers a 'change of heart'. If it does not, what do our Scriptures say about such a conversion? Here again I am quoting from the Gita:

श्रेयान् स्वधर्मो विगुणः परधर्मात्स्वनुष्ठितात् ।

What does this mean? Each race, each individual, has

a heredity, has an environment, has a background, has inherited certain aptitudes and instincts, and religion is a product not only of mental outlook and effort but of hereditary, age-long, ancestral, racial and other tendencies operating obscurely and mysteriously in the case of each individual consciousness. To jettison a faith that has been ours and to take up another faith is a serious responsibility—not a responsibility that we should shirk if a real call comes but certainly not one lightly to be embarked upon. I myself believe that if there had been conversions effected from Hinduism to any other form of faith, it is the right and duty of those who feel strongly on the eternal validity of the Hindu faith and way of life to strive to re-convert those who had left the fold, provided that the same tests and conditions are applied to re-conversions as to the original conversions. That is my definite personal view.

Today, I am speaking to you as a Hindu. I occupy another position also. I am the guardian under His Highness' benevolent and impartial sway of the interests not only of his Hindu subjects, but of his Muslim subjects and Christian subjects, and therefore it is my duty not to allow Government machinery, Government funds or Government agency to embark on the task of re-conversion, however vitally necessary it may be from the Hindu point of view. What is needed is burning faith and enthusiasm and organising energy on the part of the Hindus and this task is theirs exclusively and calls for the same qualities as are exhibited by the best types of Christian missionaries. If funds are needed for organising a body of such missionaries to work amongst the people for this purpose, the Hindus of the State should ensure that they will be forthcoming. To say this is not to assail other faiths. Live and let live. The law of toleration and hospitality is mutual and reciprocal. The same rule should be applied to every faith. To sum up my argument I hold that the Temple-Entry

Proclamation will not have served its purpose fully, unless it emphasises the following points: Firstly the universality and the catholicity of the Hindu faith, secondly the necessity, as far as possible, for Hindus to hold to that faith unless and until a personal and irresistible call comes to them to embrace any other form of religion, be it Buddhism, Jainism, Christianity, Islam or Zoroastrianism; thirdly, the recognition that we have been illtreating and placing wrongful disabilites on a great mass of the population of the country, and finally the devising of ways and means for the purpose of pulling these masses out of the slough of despondency and securing them that redemption without which we ourselves shall never be redeemed.

This work is not to be undertaken, because the Scheduled Castes are threatening reprisals unless they are guaranteed appointments under Government proportionate to their population and irrespectively of their present qualifications. That should not be the line of action. It has been asserted that blood will be shed unless a certain number of jobs are bestowed; such threats take one nowhere. But it must be granted that we have erred grievously, and one of the fundamental and inevitable results of the Temple-Entry Proclamation is to make an acknowledgment and adequate atonement to those whom we have injured, whom we have slighted, whom we have kept down and ignored through many centuries. I myself regard what is happening in South Africa as the nemesis for what we have done to our own countrymen in the past. We are angry, we are resentful and we are thinking and acting in terms of retaliation against the Boers and their kindred. But what did we do? If the theories on this topic are correct, a race coming down from Central Asia to the Punjab and later to the confines of the Vindhyas found certain inhabitants whom they proceeded to enslave, and to whom they denied many human rights. Some

of our Dharma Sastras contain sentences which are impossible to justify or defend. The procedure adopted by narrow, fanatical Boers, half-Dutch or half-German in origin, who colonised South Africa, who enjoyed the benefit of the best climate in the world and found the Negro and the Bantu populations willing to work for them, and not being content with that, invited the Indians to develop their country and finally got jealous of their industry and frugality and are now trying to squeeze them out, is not one that we can copy with advantage or safety, not to mention higher considerations.

I shall now deal with some matters of detail and then conclude. It has been stated, as I told you, that there has been a blasphemous attack on Christianity in my book *World Religions.* It is well that this audience hears those blasphemies from me. On page 33 of that book occurs this passage:

> 'The greatness of Jesus lay, however, in his bold and unflinching adherence to a religion of love and meekness that was radical, revolutionary and in truth communistic in outlook. It was a flaming indictment of all external manifestations and pharisaic practices. His message was definitely addressed and was specially soothing to the despised and the rejected among the people. He chose the publican and the sinner, and sympathy and forgiveness were the watch-words of his Gospel.'

That is blasphemy Number 1!

> 'Breaking away from the rigidity of pharisaic teaching he transformed the God of the Jews into a loving father and an intimate companion.'

That is blasphemy Number 2!!

At page thirty-six the following is stated:

> 'Faced with rejection by his own people he evolved the idea of his messianic mission, namely, that

he should suffer and die for his faith.'

That is blasphemy No. 3!!!

The last paragraph in that chapter devoted to Jesus reads thus:

'This is the real gospel of Christ and not the mis-called Christianity into which some nations have converted the simple Eastern faiths. They have made of it a creed that has become a rod in the language of Swinburne, a creed that has been subdivided into many warring sects and that in the practical application to life has, in many parts of the world, failed to solve the problems of today, the problems of racial domination and superiority complexes, the mad quest for wealth and power and the subordination of the human soul to the demands of the transient as opposed to Christ's hunger and thirst for the life eternal.'

That is blasphemy No. 4!!!!

I can well understand race-conscious fanatics and the Ku Klux Klan and the upholders of Nazi doctrines quarrelling with this sentiment but not the followers of Christ.

That is the sum and substance of what I stated. Shall I repeat it in other words? Christ's Gospel was one of justice and mercy along socialistic and communistic lines. He anticipated many of the doctrines which are today preached under other names. Let me by way of illustration recount to you two episodes from his life. When a youth, the heir to great wealth, went to him and said in substance, 'My Lord, I am hungering for the life eternal. What shall I do?', the first answer of Jesus Christ was, 'Follow the Commandments: Honour thy father and mother. Do not commit murder; do not steal. You know the Commandments.' The young man said: 'I have followed these Commandments. I have not wilfully or deliberately sinned. And yet the thirst and hunger in me are unquenched.' Then Jesus

Christ said in substance: 'You are a man of many possessions. Sell all the goods that you have and give the proceeds to the poor, and then come.' The young man was so wealthy and so attached to his worldly power and his wealth that he could not and would not obey that direction. What Jesus Christ said on that occasion is very familiar: 'It is easier for a camel to enter the eye of a needle than for a rich man to enter the kingdom of Heaven.' That preaching was essentially communistic as well as other-worldly. On another occasion Jesus Christ, when he entered the Temple, went to the place where there were money-changers and sellers of doves and other sacrificial offerings. He remonstrated and drove out the money-changers. Many interpretations have been given of such stories. This story proves his attitude towards property and holders of property. How could it be otherwise? He was a product of the later Roman Empire and he and the Jewish territory were under the yoke of Imperial Rome. Therefore the iron entered the soul of the Hebrews who had been living on promises of the advent of a Messiah, whom most of them expected to be an earthly king. To them Christ preached a religion of sacrifice and of love and bade them turn aside from their fanatical and narrow faith. Jesus Christ has always been recognised by most Hindus as among the great Messiahs of the world.

As regards the miracles of Jesus, I have said in the book that there are two opinions on the subject. The same controversy exists as to our Puranas and to our Epics, and the validity of the Hindu faith would subsist if the stories were proved to be parables or even myths in the light of later knowledge or research. In each such revelation or manifestation as the great Sankaracharya once said, you can believe only as a result of personal investigation and research which he termed *vichara* and consequent conviction. The revelation must come to each man and must not be accepted at

second-hand. But in order that the people may not run away with the impression that it is some new and sacrilegious theory that I have invented, I have taken the trouble of utilising this occasion for quoting extracts from what has been said by some acknowledged European authorities on this topic, so that if I am blamed, I shall be deemed at least to err in good company. I shall not merely err in the company of the great Sir James Frazer, Professor Huxley, Tyndall and Herbert Spencer or even Renan, Harnack, Matthew Arnold and others. I shall err with R. F. Delancey Wellbye, whose recent book *What the Future Demands of Religion* has been very largely sold in England. He says at page 173:

> 'Christianity is not and never was original, whether considered as a supernaturally revealed religion or as a system of ethics and way of life. Not only are its supernatural and miraculous elements, like divine revelation, virgin birth, resurrection, etc., paralleled in many earlier religions, but its ethics and its philosophy for every day existence arose before and independently of Christianity.'

The great Matthew Arnold in his *Literature and Dogma* states that his object in writing that book was to reassure those who feel attachment to Christianity and to the Bible but who recognise the growing discredit befalling miracles.

To say that, is not to disparage Christianity. To say, for instance, that some of the present fundamentals of Hindu faith were in existence before the rise of Hindu religion in its present form is not to disparage Hinduism. Take Sakti worship. Today it is beginning to be recognised that the Sakti cult is anterior to the Aryan invasion. When the Aryans came and began to settle here, Sakti worship was part of their religious belief and practice. Where great ideas float in

the air, those great ideas are seized upon and utilised for the reformation, transformation and sublimation of the human soul. There is no rejection, and there need be no spurning of any excepting what is false.

Furthermore, writing on the Bible, Herbert George Wood, M.A., Director of Studies, Woodbrooke, Birmingham, Lecturer on the New Testament, Fellow of Jesus College, Cambridge, has stated as follows in the *Encyclopaedia Britannica* (*Vide* Vol. 3, page 501):

'Side by side with the advance of natural science came the development of literary and historical scholarship, and the demand that the Bible should be read and studied like any other book. This meant not that the Bible was the same in character as any other book but that the same canons of criticism must be applied to the national literature of the Hebrews and the writings of the first Christians as were applied to the literature and history of other people or to the classical documents of other faiths. The study of Hebrew and Greek texts dissolved at last the cement by which the doctrine of inspiration had held together the whole Bible as a homogeneous Divine product. The discrepancies and disharmonies in the scriptures could no longer be disguised. Moreover, many traditional beliefs concerning the date and authorship of particular books were found to have no support in the text of the Bible itself. Thomas Hobbes had observed that the Pentateuch seems to be written about Moses rather than by Moses. Literary criticism showed that the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch was a Rabbinic tradition, which was unsupported by the Pentateuch.

'Again the net effect of the progress of natural science and literary criticism was to undermine

the claim made for the scriptures on the grounds of their alleged antiquity and absolute harmony. The traditional arguments from prophecy ceased to carry weight and the appeal to miracles was discounted.'

Nothing that I have said is one-tenth as strong as these passages. I want to be judged in the identical spirit of charity by which the *Encyclopaedia Britannica* is judged. I do not yet know whether the *Encyclopaedia* is expurgated or prevented access to the Public Libraries of the World or stigmatised as blasphemous.

There is another aspect which may also be borne in mind and which some friends of ours seem to forget. I would ask the *Universe* and the *Herald* and their defenders to turn up the pages of the History of England and of the Histories of Catholic Kingdoms in Europe and elsewhere. Travancore and India as a whole will not suffer by comparison with them as to the treatment of heretics and dissidents and of those who committed no fault except being born outside the pale of the faith. Roman Catholic emancipation in England took place only as late as 1829. Until then Roman Catholics were debarred from many avocations and opportunities. And it was not until 1926 that a number of other disabilities were removed. The Act of 1549, forbidding the possession of Catholic Liturgies and books of devotion was formally repealed only in 1926. The Religious Houses Act of 1559, which declared religious Orders to be superstitious and gifts for their benefit therefore voidable, as being for a supertitious use, was also repealed only in 1926, and this Act specially applied to Catholic Orders. It was not until 1892 that Cardinal Vaughan was able to get a formal reversal of the policy of the Holy See forbidding Catholics to attend the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge. This is recorded in Vol. 19, page 419 of the *Encyclopaedia Britannica*.

I am mentioning all these points not for the purpose

of mere controversy or to vindicate the principle of the pot calling the kettle black. On the other hand, I definitely assert that what has been done by this State, what has been done by Hindu Rulers in the whole of India has been to tolerate and allow every one to preach and hold his faith. There has been no great religious persecution in India initiated by the followers of the Hindu faith after the Buddhistic period and, God willing, there will be none to the end of time. But it is not right or just on the part of any ecclesiastical dignitaries or personages to prevent other faiths from embarking on the same proselytising policy as they themselves follow. If theirs is a converting religion, ours by reaction will inevitably be a converting or rather a re-converting religion. If they will make conversion a personal and individual act arising from a personal message or inspiration, we shall not quarrel. But if they resort to mass conversions, Hindus will and must organise for mass re-conversions on the same basis and subject to the same conditions.

I shall now conclude. We have met here to commemorate a great, historic and spiritual event. India is torn by warring factions, political, social, economic and religious. If anything sheds a ray of hope in the midst of the darkness that envelops us, it is this beacon light of our faith extending to and embracing all the universe, granting succour and solace to every soul, in every state of evolution, denying no form of revelation and welcoming all modes of approach to the Divine. Such a religion, such a philosophy of life do we cherish as our heritage. And so long as we do so, we shall be safe. Otherwise, the future would be dark and dismal, face to face with such ideologies as those which have culminated in this tragic War. But I am full of hope. There are discernible amidst all our quarrels the signs of a new spirit and an uprush of the soul throughout this land of ours. We shall be carried aloft thereby on

the great flight to the citadel of peace and harmony that will guard and protect the world-to-be, in the making of which I feel confident that the underlying doctrines of our religion will play a determining part.

16. HINDU CULTURE*

A few days ago, speaking in Delhi, I asserted that I did not feel called upon to make any apology for my being a Hindu or my professing myself to be one. It will not be within my province this evening, doctrinally to expound the tenets of Hinduism, or to analyse the products of Hindu thought and speculation and of Hindu ventures into the realms of the intellect and the spirit. My idea, on the other hand, will be, within the time permitted to me by the exigencies of the day and the patience of my audience, to define what Culture is, what Hindu Culture connotes and stands for, whether it means anything to the world, whether it is worth preserving, and whether, if worth preserving, how we shall best preserve it.

What does Culture mean? If one were inclined to be cynical or jocose on the subject, one might quote some lines from one of the ballads of W. S. Gilbert:

> If you're anxious for to shine in the high aesthetic line as a man of culture rare,
> You must get up all the germs of the transcendental terms, and plant them everywhere.
> You must lie upon the daisies, and discourse in novel phrases of your complicated state of mind,
> The meaning doesn't matter if it's only idle chatter of a transcendental kind.

I do not propose to indulge in cynicism this evening and shall avoid that 'chatter of a transcendental kind.' Culture is often regarded as a synonym or an excuse for being aloof and arrogant and for attributing to one-

---

* Inaugural Address delivered under the auspices of the Cultural League, Madura, on 28th October 1944.

self a certain apartness from the rest of human life. That attitude is essentially wrong. But Culture is really comprehensive and catholic. A famous Latin poet has said: 'I am a man. Nothing that appertains to humanity is foreign to me.' My own definition of Culture would be to follow the definition of a literary artist, now not as fashionable as he once was—Matthew Arnold. In his *Literature and Dogma*, wherein he combated some of the prevalent superstitions of his times and pleaded for a greater dissemination of right-mindedness amongst Englishmen than, according to him, had been attained in the country, he defined culture thus: 'Culture was, in fact, the acquainting ourselves with the best that has been known and said in the world and thus with the history of the human spirit.' Culture, therefore, is the knowledge of the history, the appraisal of the history, of the human spirit in its adventure through the realms of the intellect and the imagination, the knowledge of its aspirations, its achievements and its failures.

What does Hindu Culture mean? Is there such a thing as Hindu Culture? First of all, let me ask who or what is a Hindu? Sometime ago the idea in Europe about the Hindu was that he was an indolent, mysterious and impracticable person unfit for the battle and controversies of the world, fit to be pitied or at the best patted on the back but not specially useful to himself or to the world. In order that I may not be accused of exaggeration when I describe thus the estimate of the Western world—at least of the Western literary world —let me read to you certain lines by a modern poet on what he calls the 'Spirit of the East':

Reposeful, patient, undemonstrative,
Luxurious, enigmatically sage,
Aloof from our mutations and unrest:
Alien to our achievements and desires.
Another brain dreaming other dreams,
Another heart recalling other Loves.'

The idea underlying these lines is that Eastern thought and Eastern spirit are so aloof from the realms of activity that they need not be taken seriously by the world's workers. Until the Nobel Prize was given to an Indian, nobody really bothered about her literature or her scientific work or administrative achievements. Until at least a second-rate journalist of America or London shed the light of his benign kindness upon, let us say, Mr. A. S. P. Aiyar or myself, we felt 'left out.'

Recently, we have had a series of lectures given here by the Rev. Father Heras and by the learned President of this League; and both of them have referred to the Paleolithic period, and the Mohenjadaro and the Harappa inscriptions in propounding their respective theories about the ancient Indian civilisation. Mr. Kanakasabhai Pillai, in a book entitled *The Tamils a Thousand Years Ago*, evolved a novel theory about the origin of a separate civilisation of the South. I think it was Dr. Caldwell who invented the word 'Dravida' in the sense in which it is now used in controversy as excluding and apart from the Aryan. Dr. Caldwell's knowledge of Sanskrit or Sanskrit literature was however not very deep or profound. Otherwise, he would have found that the word 'Dravida' is used in Sanskrit literature to include a Brahmin as in the word *Pancha Dravida*. The great Sankaracharya refers to Gnanasambanda as द्राविडशिशु in his *Soundarya Lahari*.

To my understanding, this question of the historical origin of race, is irrelevant from the point of view of the study of Hindu culture, however useful it may be from the point of view of anthropology, and palaeontology. In estimating the sum-total of human activity, does it very much matter whether the Proto-Aryan of four thousand years ago kept himself aloof from the surrounding body politic and tried to influence society and its ideals from without, or whether he allowed himself to be submerged in the body politic and attempted

to influence its ideas and outlook from within? As a race, we never resented intrusions or even invasions, I am afraid. We have ever been hospitable to other races, beliefs and doctrines.

I would, therefore, in the study of this history of human culture, keep out all these archaeological and historical disquisitions and analyses of origins. I would go further and say that according to the definition which I shall submit to this great audience, Hindu culture transcends specific creeds or faiths. Let us look at the matter a little more closely. Does Hindu culture mean a specific creed, or faith, a particular artistic or aesthetic or spiritual practice or tradition, or is it confined to a geographical boundary? I say, No. Hindu culture, according to me and my thesis, is an outlook, an attitude, it is a habit of mind, and of thought, a mode of approach to the great problems, aesthetic, artistic, social, religious and political, of the world. That is what I would emphasise at the beginning, middle and end of my discourse. In other words, to my mind, India has been a synthesis of religions, creeds, and doctrines, not always mutually reconcilable, political doctrines, and political practices, social doctrines and social practices, some outworn, some gathering momentum, some freshly entering the arena, all of them existing side by side, by a spirit of *live and let live*, by a spirit of great and tolerant understanding which has enabled all those separate sub-cultures to exist and to unite in a macrocosm of culture.

I make bold to claim that in the history of the Indian spirit, disparateness, division, disunion, linguistic or racial or territorial, never played a great or dominant part. Diversity in unity was in essence the significance, the summation and the validity of our culture. Not long ago, I lighted upon a striking passage, which, amongst the controversies of these days, needs to be remembered and pondered upon. It is from a treatise

by perhaps the greatest Pure Mathematician of today and one who, in his philosophical approaches, has approximated along the path of rigid science most nearly to what Mr. A. S. P. Aiyar in the course of his introductory remarks called Suddha Advaita. I am referring to Professor Whitehead's *Science and the Modern World.* He says:

'Almost equally dangerous is the Gospel of Uniformity. The differences between the nations and races of mankind are required to preserve the conditions under which higher development is possible. One main factor in the upward trend of animal life has been the power of wandering. "Animals wander into new conditions. They have to adapt themselves or die."

'Mankind has wandered from the trees to the plains, from the plains to the sea coast, from climate to climate, from continent to continent, and from habit of life to habit of life. When a man ceases to wander, he will cease to ascend in the scale of being. Physical wandering is still important, but greater still is the power of man's spiritual adventures—adventures of thought, adventures of passionate feeling, adventures of aesthetic experience. A diversification among human communities is essential for the provision of the incentive and material for the Odyssey of the human spirit.'

That is the principle which has underlain the whole of the history of Indian life and Indian culture as I shall endeavour presently to illustrate my contention by examples.

Now, as a first example, let me refer to the term Hinduism. Some mean by it the worship of the *Saguna Brahman;* some people mean the worship of the *Nirguna Brahman;* some people think of Smritis and Tantras and of various Avatars or manifestations of the Deity in this connection. But is it remembered that the propounder or originator of the Charvaka philosophy who was also regarded as a Hindu was not sent

out from the Hindu fold? His philosophy was not thrown aside or jettisoned. Barhaspatya was the name of a somewhat different doctrine of materialism. Brihaspati said in a very memorable passage that he would not only not allow any superhuman validity or revelationary power to the Vedas but that he would question everything, including the basis of all kinds of knowledge and all evidence, perception and inference. That is what is called the Barhaspatya form of Nasthika philosophy. That also is part of Hindu philosophy, part of Hindu culture, not to be dissociated from it, not to be put away as an excrescent product of Indian thought but to be taken into account as a natural reaction to the current philosophic thought of the times. It is one of the side-streams which go to make up the mighty river of Hindu philosophy. Following the Barhaspatyas were the Lokayatas; then came Buddhism and Jainism. Their philosophies too, though generally regarded as of the Nasthika cult, were tolerated. The Jains denied the authenticity, the validity, and the binding character of the Vedas and what they stood for. The Jains cultivated a separate philosophy of life, a separate doctrine, the transmutations and development of which are part of Indian history. Do we regard the Jains as apart from us? The Sikhs disregard much that we hold to be true. Do we regard them as representing any other than Hindu culture?

What then do we mean by Hinduism? It may be argued that practically every race is,. for propaganda purposes, taken by me to be part of the Hindu race, that every belief is stated to be part of Hinduism and that I am reaching out and grasping at every system of thought and claiming it as Hindu. I say 'Yes' and 'No'. I hold and I profess the faith that Hindu culture is essentially a universal culture that is big enough and wide enough to include Islam, the religion of Christ, the doctrines of St. Paul and the early Fathers and also those

great Reform movements which in Europe and America and in India have followed on the track of the recurrent and renewed religious impulses in the human soul. But having said this I also affirm that Hindu culture as such has a special genius or temper or significance.

What then are its essentials? The first trait characteristic of Hindu culture is, according to me, courage and self-reliance. There was nothing, no domain of thought, no impossibility, no supernatural barrier, no natural obstacle, that stood in the way of the Indian people penetrating into the arcana of the Unseen and Unknown. Those of us who remember the *Kathopanishad* know that when Nachiketas was sent away from his father's house and asked to repair to the domain of Yama, he went thither. Yama was pleased with him and wanted him to choose three boons. First, Nachiketas asked that his father Gautama might be appeased in thought and composed in mind and that his anger towards him should disappear. Next, he wanted to know the true nature of Agni who confers Heaven and Immortality on its knower; getting these two boons, Nachiketas asked the third in this famous verse:

येयं प्रेते विचिकित्सा मनुष्ये अस्तीत्येके नायमस्तीति चैके ।
एतद्विद्यामनुशिष्टस्त्वयाऽहं वराणामेष वरस्तृतीयः ॥

'There is speculation among men as to whether, after death, the soul exists or does not exist. This I should like to know, instructed by Thee. This is the third boon I crave.' Yama did not want to confer this boon as it meant the disclosure or revelation of the knowledge of the Omniscient and Omnipotent. So he attempted to side-track Nachiketas from this quest and offered him, as alternatives, progeny, cattle, elephants, horses, gold, empire, and longevity, etc. But the boy was not to be easily turned away from his pursuit.

यस्मिन्निदं विचिकित्सन्ति मृत्यो यत्साम्पराये महति ब्रूहि नस्तत् ।
योऽयं वरो गूढमनुप्रविष्टो नान्यं तस्मान्नचिकेता वृणीते ॥

'He insisted: Tell me, Yama, what it is they inquire into as to the great question concerning the next world. I want no other boon but the privilege of learning the secret knowledge.'

Realising that he had met a student who was in deadly earnest, he unfolded to him the true nature of the Soul and Over-Soul. Nachiketas is a type of the dauntless and eternal Hindu search for the ultimate.

Dealing with the immensity of the unformed world before creation as we know it, the Rig-Veda poses the question: Was there a vast nothing before something came into existence, or was there something before that nothing? The Rig-Veda thinks and speaks definitely of a world behind and beyond the gods. So you see there was no boundary or limit which the ancient Indian thinkers set before themselves in the quest after Truth and the Infinite, no limit—voluntary or forced. They did not take God for granted. They did not take Godhead for granted. That has been one of the characteristics of Hindu philosophy and the Hindu doctrine of life. They wanted each man to be the witness of truth as it was revealed by personal experience to each man. This is what Yoga attempts to achieve. We have no uncontradictable and unquestionable documents, no special revelations, and our Scriptures are not final excepting in so far as their revelations and those doctrines are and can be manifested in the life of the man experiencing their impact on his soul. What may be called the personal experience, personal cognition of the validity of doctrine, is a natural factor of the Hindu culture and therefore is it universal in the sense in which few cultures are universal. Islam, with its great affirmations of monotheism, is perhaps the one religion which practises what it preaches and is the only religion in the

world in which the Negro and the most evolved types sit side by side at table and in mosque. There is no difference between man and man. We talk of democracy. No uncompromising democracy has been evolved in any other system to the extent to which it was evolved by the desert sons of Arabia. This was Muhammed's special message. Jesus Christ's message was in essence a message of meekness, self-sacrifice, and unflinching love that was manifested in what was a form of socialism or communism. He preached that everybody should give up everything to possess heaven. He was a rebel against the established order of things in his day and was a socialist to the core. And yet his is the religion that is now professed by the great capitalist nations of this world. The religion of Jesus Christ in its pristine form has been overlaid by many superimposed doctrines and dogmas, all invoking his name. The religion of that communist, that great socialist, might appeal to one type of people. Then comes the man who worships a stone painted red underneath a banian tree and expresses before it all his longings and prayers. That is a type which you cannot despise or ignore because, to the extent to which he is able to think of something other than his own self, to that extent the symbol on which he chooses to centre his thought is useful for his onward march to perfection. You remember that Lord Krishna has said in the Gita:

येऽप्यन्यदेवताभक्ता यजन्ते श्रद्धयान्विताः ।
तेऽपि मामेव कौन्तेय यजन्त्यविधिपूर्वकम् ॥

'They who worship other deities in devotion and sacrifice in reality worship me in their several ways.'

Our culture is able to comprehend within itself the worshipper of a stone image and the worshipper of the Suddha Advaita. Let me quote again:

रूपं रूपविवर्जितस्य भवतो ध्यानेन यत्कल्पितं
स्तुत्याऽनिर्वचनीयताऽखिलगुरो दूरीकृता यन्मया ।
व्यापित्वञ्च निराकृतं भगवतो यत्तीर्थयात्रादिना
क्षन्तव्यं जगदीश तद्विकलता दोषत्रयं मत्कृतम् ॥

'Having ascribed form to that which is formless, I have committed my first sin. Having praised with words of laudation that which is indescribable, I have committed my second sin. Having located in temple and a particular locality that which has no location, I have committed my third sin. Oh, Great God, pray pardon me for the three sins.'

On a survey of Hindu thought we shall find whether the approach be through pantheism, polytheism or even atheism or the communism or the socialism of Christ or the democracy of Islam—that there is nothing that cannot be comprehended in that synthesis which I venture to call and shall dare to call 'Hindu Culture.'

There is another aspect of culture which, in these discussions, must not be lost sight of. Culture and religion can be twisted so as to become intruments for unworthy ends, for purposes foreign to their original connotations. Narrow, warped, self-centred and exclusive notions of the greatness of one's own civilisation or a national culture and religion, of their incessant exaltation to the detriment of other cultures and religions are indeed responsible for some of the barbarities of the so-called medieval ages, for the modern extravagances of Signor Mussolini, the atrocities of Nazism and some of the unpleasant manifestations in England and America in the religious and sociological spheres! Hindu culture has striven to avoid this danger. Lest I should be regarded as blowing the Hindu trumpet, let me place before you what a detached observer like Mr. C. H. Reily, Professor of Architecture in the University of

Liverpool, has recently said. During a discussion of Indian architecture he observed:

> 'It is in many ways one of the purest of all arts belonging to a complex and highly organised civilisation. It is probable that all of these characteristics derive from the Indian attitude to religion, for this art is more entirely bound up with religious mythology than any other. Whereas in the early empires religion is an adjunct of the State, all art, even that specifically dedicated to the Gods, tends to become a field for State propaganda and publicity and to have the impurity of official art. But in India religious sentiment transcended the motive of the State, and the splendour of the temples was a genuine offering to the God, not a means to heighten the royal prestige.'

In other words, Hindu culture was saved partly by its comprehensiveness and partly for the above reasons from being the handmaid to purely political ends.

This courage in grappling with all problems and this conscious synthesis are two predominant characteristics of the Hindu culture. I may mention a third. Throughout Indian art, Indian literature and Indian life, there is an abiding consciousness of the Infinite and the Immanence of the Divine in small things as well as great. This, to my mind, is a special characteristic of Hindu culture. To illustrate this, let me deliberately choose two subjects like mathematics and grammar—most apparently distant from what may be called culture in the aesthetic sense. Most of us have been painful sufferers from the rules of grammar. Some of us habitually break those rules; others endeavour not to do so, with results not entirely successful. But grammar, as understood in most countries, has always been regarded only as an instrument, a humble, necessary but not inseparable adjunct of culture. It is in India alone

that Patanjali and those who followed him thought and spoke of the worship of the Sabda Brahma as *Sabdabrahmopasanam.* They have sought to analyse every sound. They have sought to assimilate and bring out the congruence between sound and substance—Vak and Sabda (वाक् and शब्द). Those who have read the *Mahabhashya* cannot but realise the combination of philosophy and grammar and the science of sound. Each word, each sound, has got a life-history of its own, linked up with the science of the नादब्रह्म the Supreme manifested as sound or Logos. My argument is that grammar was not regarded merely as an instrument for the study of sound and speech but also for building and establishing a philosophy thereupon. Taking mathematics, we know that India invented the zero. We also invented what is probably not so well-known, the root of (—1), an imaginary quantity. The whole mathematical science with which is entwined the theory of the conception of the Universe, and the doctrine of Relativity, is based upon the Indian discovery of the zero and the root of (—1), and our mathematical writers deal with their science as part of cosmic philosophy just as Einstein, Eddington and Jeans and Whitehead are now doing. Lest, here again, I may be accused of overstating my case, let me read to you what a great mathematician, Lancelot Hogben, has said in his *Mathematics for the Million*:

> 'The epochal character of this step, namely the invention of the cypher, has been universally recognised. Laplace, the brilliant mathematical astronomer who told Napolean that God is not a necessary hypothesis in natural science, refers to this discovery in a significant passage.
>
> 'It is India that gave us the ingenious method of expressing all numbers by means of ten symbols, each symbol receiving a value of position,

> as well as an absolute value: a profound and important idea which appears so simple to us now that we ignore its true merit, but its very simplicity, the great ease which it has lent to all computations puts our arithmetic in the first rank of useful inventions; and we shall appreciate the grandeur of this achievement when we remember that it escaped the genius of Archimedes and Apollinius, two of the greatest men produced by antiquity.'

I now proceed to the Higher Mathematics of today. Where has it led us? If I understand the present conception of the Universe, it resembles nothing that was talked of or talked about even twenty or thirty years ago. Following Newton, Laplace stated that he was absolutely certain of the laws of the universe. What he stated was:

> 'From the original distribution of the atoms in the primitive nebula a sufficiently great mathematical intelligence could predict the whole future history of the world.'

We were so thoroughly satisfied with such hypothesis until recently. How different are the present ideas underlying Science! Light partakes of the nature both of a wave and of a particle. It travels at 186,000 miles per second. There can be no greater possible speed than that. An atom is a nucleus plus certain vibrations or waves or emanations. It can be broken up. The behaviour of the universe and its components is not governed by strict determinism. The quantum theory has come on the Science. Let me quote again from a mathematical treatise:

'The abandonment of this assumption of determinism is one of the most striking characteristics of the present scientific outlook. Strict determination cannot be traced in the behaviour of the ultimate elements of the physical world.

'The banishment of determinism from the ultimate processes of nature is quite in keeping with this modern tendency. But is it possible to conceive of undetermined phenomena? It would seem that the answer to this question depends on whether we think, whether we have an intuition of free-will or not. If we can regard free-will as an unanalysable category of thought, then we may suppose something analogous to free-will to lie at the basis of material phenomena. Free-will and determinism then become theoretically two equally valid alternatives, and which one we adopt is to be decided purely by the evidence.

'This realisation of the nature of Science makes it clear that the material universe is a much more subjective thing than Galileo, for instance, supposed. It is difficult now to make the hard-and-fast distinction between primary and secondary qualities that Galileo made. If our perception of the colour red is merely our interpretation of certain electromagnetic waves, our perception of a tennis-ball is, it appears on the wave theory of matter, merely our interpretation of waves that are still more mysterious. Or if we turn to Relativity theory, we find that what we perceive as a tennis-ball is 'really' a region of a four dimensional continuum possessing a certain kind of curvature. Science does not tell us anything about the substance of the elements out of which we have built up the perceptual world. It tells us merely the mathematical specifications of these elements.'

I do not think I am exaggerating matters when I say that modern philosophy, as it has developed after the momentous discoveries of Prof. Einstein and Heisenberg and Max Planck and the discoveries of those who followed them, has proved that the material world is at least as subjective as objective. This means that the world of today is the world of the Hindu Vedanta. It does not essentially exist excepting as a subjective phenomenon. The more thoroughly we study the higher

sciences of today, the more are we convinced that the Hindu doctrine was correct when it seized upon the impermanence of objective existence as the central factor of world phenomena and laid emphasis on concentration of the mind, the research into the mind and the spirit as the one thing that matters, the true knowledge of the spirit being regarded as the exclusive type of knowledge leading to a proper understanding of Nature and the very foundations of the world at large.

Let me, before concluding, attempt a survey of what may be termed the main landmarks of Hindu culture. I can set out only a bare list, I would say that the first landmark is undoubtedly the Rigveda which in a nuclear form contains practically all that I have been saying today. It is a treatise mainly concerned with sacrifices, and hymns to certain Gods who were personified forces of Nature or to great leaders of thought or of warfare. It is a praise of good living; it is a prayer for sub-lunary benefits, power, and victory and possessions.

At the same time it comprises the beginnings of all subsequent speculations on the unity of life and the immanence of the Divine in all that is.

एकं सत् विप्रा बहुधा वदन्ति ।

'There is only one that exists. Learned men speak of it differently.' The Rigveda also exemplifies what the Gita later on stresses, namely, that the life spiritual and the life in the world are not antagonistic but mutually complementary or supplementary. Hindu culture appreciates the differences amongst men—social, tribal, cultural, hereditary and otherwise—but also gives chances for every body to progress from stage to stage towards the ultimate goal of liberation. Those persons are misled who seek to justify the excrescences of the caste system as it exists today, merely because there was an original four-fold classification of men according

to *karma* and *guna* and I make bold to assert that the emphasis on caste or occupational inequalities is not part of the true Hindu spirit or of Hindu culture.

The next landmarks that I wish to refer to are the Upanishads, wherein we see side by side with the recognition of the facts of mundane existence a fearless search for fundamental truths that transcend the mundane sphere. I have already narrated to you the story of Nachiketas. This was typical of the Upanishadic approach.

Then we come to those great men, the Buddha, Sankara, Ramanuja, Madhwachari and other prophets and leaders. What a unity in diversity is suggested even when we pronounce their names! To the Buddha came the inner call and he gave up his kingdom and evolved a philosophy of the soul progressing to Nirvana or Bliss by way of self-reliance and recognition of immutable law. But from first to last the Buddha was Hindu in outlook and he represented one of the summations or integrations of Hindu culture and he was rightly and ultimately recognised as one of our Avatars. The South Indian saints, Sankara, Ramanuja, Madhwa had their separate systems of philosophic speculation, yet a fundamental unity underlies all their thought and efforts. Indeed, all of them accepted the Upanishads and the Brahmasutras and evolved their special doctrine in the course of commenting on the same *Prasthanathraya* or threefold basis of Hindu thought.

The next characteristic of Hindu culture is the *Gurukula* system which is one of the outstanding contributions made to the world's ideals. Truth can never come solely from books. Truth can never be imparted mechanically. It can come only from the living personality and be transmitted to living spirit and that is the *Gurukula* ideal. That is one of the greatest conceptions of our civilisation which if we lose, we shall suffer.

Another definite contribution of Hindu culture to

the world is the conception of sovereignty which is *sui generis*, the *Janaka* ideal of kingship, as I may call it. Sovereignty is thought of as viceroyalty, the king being regarded as the representative of God and as an instrument not for imposing his will on his subjects but for exemplifying and translating into practice the divine *Dharma*. The sovereign was bound rigidly by certain laws, the laws of *Dharma*, divine and conventional, and he is liable to be put aside if he transgresses them. This conception of sovereignty is the unique contribution of Hindu culture to the political thought of the world. Take the Greek conception of democracy. All or practically all the Athenian citizens gathered in the market-place ; and they were sovereigns in their corporate capacity and, as was proved in the case of the condemnation of Socrates, there was no limit to the operation of their arbitrary collective-will. So likewise in American and English law today. what the Parliament or Congress says is final. I do not know whether this audience is aware that even the Prayer Book has been formally enacted in England by an Act of Parliament. The king in Parliament in England and the Congress in U.S.A. are supreme law givers. But as was shown by Sri Rama, the kings of India realised that there was something above the king and the people, which was their mentor and guide, the law of the inner soul to which they owed primary allegiance, also called their *Dharma*. That conception of kingship, as a dedication, a viceroyalty, a devolution of authority and jurisdiction, is a particular conception of sovereignty which has received less attention than it should have at the hands of scholars and teachers.

The achievements of Hindu culture in the realms of art, of architecture, sculpture and music and painting are all correlated and follow a plan. When we turn to the Ajanta and Ellora caves, when we see the great temples of South India or the South Indian bronzes, or

when we enter the domain of music and listen to our songs and Hymns, what ~~to~~ do we find? Here again the genius of Hindu culture is not to differentiate and divide but to unite and assimilate. True, some of the manifestations of that culture are not in accord with European aesthetic ideals. If you see some of our bronzes and demand correct anatomical details, we shall probably find it difficult to discover them. If we want to find out exactly the stress and action of each muscle, we shall fail. What Hindu art dealt with was not to picture the biceps or the hip joint or elbow or the jaw or the face or the eyes, but to depict what the figure stood for, what the idea underlying a particular pose was and what the essential interior portrait was of the man or woman who was regarded as a symbol. That assimilative symbolism was the characteristic feature of Hindu art. It is very remarkable that some of the most modern developments in European painting and sculpture are reverting to this symbolistic ideal though some European artists confuse the ugly with the real.

Let me recapitulate. I hold that culture is an adventure of the human soul into the region of the things that matter. It has developed in India along specific lines. To affirm and proclaim that there is an authentic and valid Hindu culture is not to decry the authenticity or validity of other cultures. But my point is that the main characteristic or the ideal of Hindu culture is to banish all separatism and proclaim the essential unity, physical and spiritual, of the Cosmos. Other modes of culture may have other objectives. With them I shall not deal just now. But to my mind Hindu art, Hindu philosophy, Hindu speculation, and Hindu science, have been distinguished by three traits. The first of these is the unflinching daring and courage in the realms of abstract speculation and philosophy. The second is the spirit of tolerance towards all modes of approach to the solution of the world's problems, and to-

wards all faiths and other cultures. Hospitality in providing food, raiment and shelter may be common, but mental or spiritual hospitality is rarer and finer and I venture to lay claim for our culture that it has stood for this form of hospitality. Lastly, there is in this culture a sense of the pervasive Immanence of the Divine, a sense of the cyclic progress of the universe developing in its evolution many races, many ideals, many disillusionments, and many yearnings and aspirations but always ultimately reaching out towards the Infinite, the One. The world needs and cannot ignore such a culture. It should realise and practise its all-embracing catholicity of outlook if it is to emerge from the present state of confusion in thought and chaos in action.

17. SRI TYAGARAJA BRAHMAM AND HIS TIMES*

This annual function marks the date of the passing away of Sri Tyagarajaswami who lived, according to the best authorities, from 1759 to January 1847. The celebration owes its inception to the untiring efforts of that musical savant and devotee, Bangalore Nagarathnamma, who contributed so greatly to build the temple over the *samadhi* and helped to inaugurate these festivities. Although Tyagarajaswami was born at Tiruvalur and named after the presiding deity of that sacred shrine, his whole life was centred in the locality in which we are gathered and where the Lord of the five rivers, Panchanadiswara, has his seat. It is a matter for profound satisfaction that not only scholarly experts but the musical laity have, in their several ways, offered their co-operation in making a resounding success of these periodical gatherings.

In the south of India it is not too much to assert that the musical trio, Tyagarajaswami, Muthuswami Dikshitar and Syama Sastri, along with the artistic group that surrounded and was dominated by the Royal musician, Sri Swati Tirunal, established the classical tradition of the South and that the system of *kritis* now regarded as the foundation of musical performances owes its perfection to this great assemblage of composers and musicians amongst whom perhaps Tyagarajaswami's influence was most widely pervasive.

The artistic contacts between Tanjore and Travancore were not only symbolised by the visit of the Travancore musicians, Vadivelu and Govinda Marar, to Tiru-

---

* Address on the Inauguration of the Ninety-Eighth "Aradhana" Celebrations of Sri Tyagaraja Brahmam at Tiruvadi on the 1st January 1945.

vaiyar but there have been also other instances of mutual influence and assimilation. It may be of special interest to this audience to learn that, touring in these parts in the eighties of the last century, His Highness Visakham Tirunal of Travancore who gloried in the literary and musical traditions of his Royal family that have been maintained unbroken down to this day stated:

'I rejoice that I stand today on the soil that has produced Tyagaraja and nourished Appaya Dikshitar.'

In dealing however summarily with the subject of this sketch, I think it is needless to remind Indians and especially those who are the nurslings of the Kaveri, of the place that music holds and should hold in the scheme of life. One of the greatest of English art-critics, Walter Pater, was responsible for the observation that 'all art constantly aspires towards the condition of music', meaning thereby that music, whether simple or subtle, is the sublimation of the human effort to reach perfection. Such an idea is common to the West and the East. In his poem on the Musician—*Abt Vogler*—Robert Browning has sung:

"But God has a few of us
whom He whispers in the ear;
The rest may reason and welcome;
'tis we musicians know."

India has identified Iswara with melody, and the Vedas have proclaimed that the world rests in sound—शब्द निष्ठ जगत्. In greater detail a Sanskrit poet asserts that he reaches heaven most easily who knows the science and the art of the Vina, is acquainted with *sruthi* and *jāthī* and who is cognizant of the principles of *tāla*, or musical time.

वीणावादनतत्वज्ञ: श्रुतिजातिविशारद: ।
तालज्ञश्चाप्रयासेन मोक्षमार्गं गमिष्यति ॥

Maharaja Sri Swathi Tirunal who was a finished

poet as well as a great composer declares in his *Bhakti Manjari*:

> तन्त्रीनादविमिश्रितं लययुतं तारस्वनात्युज्ज्वलं
> श्रोत्रानन्दकरं चरिष्णुभिरलं ग्रामत्रयेऽपि स्वरैः ।
> गीतं तावकनामनिर्भरसुधाजुष्टं न चेत् तत् पुनः
> व्यर्थं व्यर्थमरण्यरोदनमित्र प्रायो रमावल्लभ ॥

He assigns a due place to the Vina accompaniment, stresses the place of *laya* and what he terms *tāraswana,* emphasises the importance of sweetness as well as of expertness, indicates the place of the *swaras* and the three *gramas—shadjagrama, madhyamagrama* and *gandharagrama,* and, above all, asserts that musical effort attains its climax in the praise of the Supreme arising out of the fervent devotion of the singer. In his own language, all other music is like cries in the forest and in those verses he epitomises the elements and ideals of Karnataka music. A loving description of Trivandrum during one of the temple festivals in his स्यानन्दूरपुरवर्णन (Syânandürapura Varnana) contains this description.

> विश्वजनकर्णसुस्वापादकाननादर्वाणानिस्सरद्विविधश्रुतिमण्डलोद्भिन्नस्वरनिकरो मधुरतरहारिचरितमयसाहित्यगानेन दिविलसन्तं हाहाहूहूमुखगन्धर्वनिकरमपि विस्मयेर्ष्याकलुषीभूतं कुर्वाणा गायकसमुदायसमुल्लसात ॥

Here also we observe the insistence on technical excellence in unison with साहित्य or poetic gift and the manifestation of true Bhakti.

This is not the occasion to discuss the differences between the West and the East in regard to melody, harmony and so forth; but the place assigned to music everywhere in cultural life is unchallengeable although as a critic has stated, the westerner looks at music vertically

and produces harmony and the easterner looking horizontally produces melody.

Perhaps the most striking difference between the Eastern and the Western evolution in musical composition may be discerned in the almost exclusive adherence of the Indian composer and artist to religion, whilst love and war predominate over religion in the music of the West. The close connection of music in most countries with religion and religious observances is realised in general but few have set the art on such a pedestal as Sri Tyagaraja, who described the emergence of divinity in the Chittaranjani song *Nadatanumanisam*, though of course it cannot be forgotten that Sarngadeva had already apostrophised the deity as *Nadatanu*.

The history of Indian music is ancient and dates from the simple though elevated strains of the Sama Veda; and Sangeeta as connoting song, instrument, dance and expression was as old as the Aryan civilisation, which, when it came into contact with Dravidian life, characteristically gave to and received from it a great deal. Just as the Nataraja image is the climax of South Indian Art, so the dance of Natesa in the presence of the Devi, with all the main Divinities contributing to the synthesis of *Sangita* is the integration of the Hindu ideals of musical effort.

कैलासशैलभुवने त्रिजगज्जनित्रीं
गौरीं निवेश्य कनकाञ्चितरत्नपीठे ।
नृत्यं विधातुमभिवाञ्छति शूलपाणौ
देवाः प्रदोषसमये तमनुव्रजन्ति ॥

वाग्देवी धृतवल्लकी शतमखो वेणुं दधत् पद्मज-
स्तालानन्दकरो रमा भगवती गेयप्रयोगान्विता ।
विष्णुस्सान्द्रमृदङ्गवादनपटुः देवास्समन्तात् स्थिताः
सेवन्ते तमनु प्रदोषसमये देवं मृडानीपतिम् ॥

In this great concert, the Lord of Hosts dances in Kailasa before Parvati in front of the assembled gods; Saraswati plays on the Vina; Indra on the flute; Brahma keeps time; Lakshmi sings and Vishnu handles the deep-toned mridanga. Competent scholars believe that the South contributed elaboration and subtlety to an art which was originally simple and pastoral. Sarngadeva, one of the earliest writers on music, was in his own person typical of the combination of the North and the South. He was a native of Kashmir but settled down in peninsular India. To him we owe the classification of music and ascription of the due place to the *Desi* or indigenous style. It may be remembered that the ancient *Margi* style was regarded and described as *Bhavabhajana* or as helping to destroy *Samsara*, and the *Desi* style as *Janaranjana* or as pleasing to the people at large. The former style has also been described as *Nibaddha* or linked with words, the latter being regarded as comparatively free from the slavery of the word, *Anibaddha*. From the days of the Nayaks of Tanjore who were great patrons of music and in whose court flourished statesmen and musicians like Govinda Dasa and his son Venkatamakhi, the doctrine was asserted and implemented that our music should be regarded as wholly *Desi*. This in fact is the basis of Venkatamakhi's *Chathurdandiprakasika* to which great work we owe the classification into 72 *Melakarthas* and *Janyas*. Tyagaraja himself was one of those who freed the *kriti* from overmuch tyranny of words. He, in contrast to his predecessors like Arunachala-kavi, composed his songs in fairly simple and homely language and one need not go further afield than the songs *Girirajasuta* and *Pahiramadoota* as instances of this characteristic.

Taking a rapid survey of Indian music, so far as its history is recorded, we begin with Jayadeva Gosvami's *Gita Govinda*, which is alike one of the great mystic poems of the world and a treasure-house of song and

which owes and acknowledges its debt to the *Bharata Natya Sastra* composed as early as the 6th century A.D. It is the earliest recorded piece of music that we possess and the author proudly asserts that his followers will come from three groups—skilled musicians, true Bhaktas and finished poets. The *Sangita Ratnakara* of Sarngadeva was published in the 16th century and Venkatamakhi's *magnum opus* in the 17th. But by the end of the 17th century the separate characteristics of the Northern and the Southern styles had been definitely differentiated, and Kabir, Tulsidas, Mira Bai, Surdas and Tukaram had perfected in the North a technique full of devotion and full also of appeal to the multitude. A link between the North and the South was furnished by Purandara Vitthala who created his simple and touchingly fascinating *Devarnamas* in Kannada and who was the artistic predecessor of Ramdas Swami of Bhadrachalam whose *kirtanas* are sung all over the Andhra country today. Suffice it to say here that the development of music in the North and in the South has been along parallel lines and there has been no coalescence of methods. The talk of fusion or union is not practicable and perchance it is wisest to remember as Jesus once declared: 'In my father's house are many mansions.' So far as the South Indian practice is concerned, the earliest authentic master was Kshetragna, a native of North Arcot, who composed thousands of *padams* and dedicated them to Gopala. There followed certain great artists who produced *varnams* and others like Arunachala-kavi to whom we owe marvellous *kirtanams*. But it was almost as a sudden efflorescence that there blossomed on the banks of the Cauvery the three great composers—Tyagaraja, Muthuswami Dikshitar and Syama Sastri—who lived in the beginning of the 19th century in Tiruvalur and the neighbouring places, and who, following in the tradition of Venkatamakhi, perfected what is now regarded as the essential elements of Carnatic music.

Each of them used special expressions to denote his respective compositions—the respective indicia being Tyagarajanutha, Guruguha and Syamakrishna. Muthuswami Dikshitar's *kirtanams* are all in Sanskrit and he was a follower of the Sri Vidya. His *padams* constitute landmarks in Sanskrit prosody and imagery as well as in musical treatment, felicitous choice of words and movements in consonance with the underlying emotion or भाव being one of his rare gifts. The compositions of Syama Sastri are both in Sanskrit and Telugu. He worshipped Kanchi Kamatchi and his compositions include several *Svarajatts* embodying many *tāla* movements. Tyagaraja's works, on the other hand, were almost entirely in homely Telugu and combined fervent idealism with a personal appeal which often climbed to great poetic heights. He is the fine flower of the school inaugurated by Purandara who recaptured the Bhakti movement, a movement associated with the sage Narada, the musician of the gods.

Tyagaraja's life-history was outwardly uneventful although certain supernatural incidents have been woven into the chronicle connected with his mission and the mystery of his music. Mr. M. S. Ramaswami Aiyar, to whom all students of Tyagaraja owe so much, has imparted the information that Tyagaraja's family name was Brahmam, his father being known as Ramabrahmam. The appellation *Tyagabrahmam* by which his disciples lovingly designate him is thus literally as well as psychologically correct. His father seems to have destined Tyagaraja for a life of literary scholarship and entered him as a student in the Sanskrit College at Tiruvayar, but the attractions of music proved to be irresistible and he dedicated himself fairly early to the art. Tradition declares that over and above the Vainika Venkataramanayya who originally instructed him, Narada himself became his preceptor and presented him with a treatise entitled *Svararnavam* which is now lost

and taught him the Tarakamantra. Tyagaraja is supposed to advert to this episode in the kriti *Svararagasudharasa*, and his gratitude to Narada is outlined in another, *Varanarada*. At the family partition, Tyagaraja received very little in the way of worldly goods but he obtained the golden image of Rama cherished in the family as an heirloom. His elder brother, although he came into possession of all the properties of the family, was yet jealous of the rising reputation as a musician of his younger brother, and the story goes that he secured and threw the image of Rama into the Cauvery. The biographers of Tyagaraja declare that Tyagaraja was absorbed in this image and in its worship and composed hymns outlining in loving detail all the rituals relating to the ceremonial worship, including the Naivedyam and the Arathi to the image. The loss of the golden image was chronicled by him in krithi *Nenenduvedakudura* in Harikamboji and when, after many months of search, the image was marvellously washed ashore and recovered the song *Etla Dorakithivo* was composed by him descriptive of this home-coming of Rama. Throughout his life, Tyagaraja consciously put aside wealth and honours. He lived with his wife and supported a large number of disciples who gathered around him and they all subsisted mainly on alms in kind gathered by *unchavritti* from householders in Tiruvayar. He appears to have been a hard taskmaster with a temper of his own and was as exacting with his disciples as with himself. The *kriti Santhamulekha* is regarded as autobiographical. In the brochure by Mr. Ramaswami Aiyar to which reference has been already made, there is an acute analysis of the tradition and the tendencies during which Tyagaraja lived. It is pointed out that the age of Tyagaraja was a transition between the age of patronage when kings and noblemen endowed and gave shelter to chosen musicians and other artists and the age of public support which only recently has come to its own. During

the time of Tyagaraja the Tanjore dynasty which in its heyday of prosperity was one of the greatest patrons of painting and letters and music had decayed, and the only locality where the love of music and its patronage were still flourishing was Travancore where, from the days of Marthanda Varma, the founder of modern Travancore and his successors (the greatest of whom was Swati Tirunal), music was both encouraged and practised by the members of the Royal family. Saraboji, the titular king of Tanjore, however, kept up some state and he was a contemporary of Tyagaraja. It is recorded that he sent an emissary to the musician asking him to compose a kirtana in his honour and we learn that he refused to do so but on the other hand composed a song in Kalyani —*Nidhisalasukhamu,* where he dilates on the theme: "Which gives greater joy, wealth or worship, in the holy presence of Rama? Which of the two is better—the praise of man or the praise of the Divine?" Such was the disdain for worldly recognition which was manifested by this man of God. Not only the biographer to whom reference has been made but other writers on Tyagaraja and his times, have outlined his career as falling into distinct periods and it may not be inappropriate before this audience to attempt a resumé of what has been said on this subject if only for the purpose of stimulating further enquiry. As already stated, Tyagaraja in his own compositions has ranged from simple *Divyanamavalis* to most complicated kirtanas though he did not emulate the reconditeness of Kshetragna or Muthuswami Dikshitar. His kirtanas were created as accompaniments of fervid worship and are often conversational and sometimes are personal outpourings outlining his life and his experiences. It has been remarked that he began by regarding Rama who was his tutelar deity as being the one supreme God, superior to every one else. His songs *Ramam Bhajeham* and *Rama Kothandarama* are typical of this mood. He is supposed to have declined even to

witness a procession of the goddess Dharmasamvardhini and instituted unflattering comparisons between her and his own Ishtadevaṭa whom he, in his song, described as *Lāvanya Rama* contrasting his beauty and grace with the attributes of the Devi whom he termed *Thāmasa matha daiva*, the deity of the Thamasa way of life.

As in the life of Shakespeare and Dante Tyagaraja seems to have had his moods of despair and periods of tribulation and, notwithstanding his spiritual quest, his song in Denuka headed *Teliyaleru Rama* is indicative of his despair of realisation and the difficulty of knowing the right path. He fell ill and ascribed his illness to the anger of the Goddess whom he disparaged and whose grace he at last implored in the song *Karuna jooda vamma*. Later, as in the case of other great poets and musicians including Shakespeare, Goethe, Mozart and Beethoven, he attained comparative peace of mind and acquired a rare catholicity of temper. To this period are attributed songs in which he has apostrophised many deities and evolved a mentality which has been styled by Professor Max Muller, 'henotheism' wherein the devotee alternately ascribes supremacy and primacy to several manifestations of Godhead. This method indeed is in the authentic Hindu line of thought and the greatest example is the Rigveda where alternately Surya, Mitra, Aditi and Varuna are dealt with as supreme. To these years belong the songs *Girirajasutha*, dealing with Ganesa, *Neevanthi daivamu* to Subrahmania, *Sambho Maha-deva* to Siva, *Pahi Rama Doota* to Hanuman and *Tulasi Jagajjanani* to the Tulasi plant.

Towards middle age, Tyagaraja resolved to go on a pilgrimage to various shrines. At Tirupati, he found that a screen separated him and Venkataramana and sang about that screen in the *Therathiyagarada*. A wealthy patron and Tamil scholar, Sundaresa Mudaliar, at Poonamalle presented him with a palanquin and a sum of money. Thieves beset him on his journey and he

is supposed to have sung the song in Darbar, *Mundu Venaka* which led to the conversion of the thieves into docility. The story recounts that they even offered to carry his palanquin. He visited in turn Conjeevaram where he sang of Kamatchi; Madhyarjunam where he is stated to have resuscitated a dead man by his composition *Sri Rama Pâdama* in Amritavahini. He then proceeded to Rameswaram. In Madura he sang the hymn *Manasunilpa* and in Srirangam was composed *Oh! Rangasayi.* In his travels, he heard a discourse on the Avatars and his mental reaction was manifested in the song *Evarinirn-ayanchirira*—'How did the wise determine who Thou art? How do they worship Thee!" His main musical contributions were in praise and honour of Sri Rama, regarding him as the summation and essence of all the Gods, as illustrated in the kriti *Dvaitamu sukhama.* His thesis on one occasion was that the syllables composing the word *Rama* epitomised the *Tatvas* of the Siva mantra and the Vishnu mantra—*Ma* being Jiva of Siva mantra and *Ra* of Vishnu mantra. It must not be however forgotten that in addition to his kritis he wrote the *Divyanamavali, Prahlada Bhakta Vijayam, Nowkacharitam* in honour of Krishna and finally the *Pancharatnas.* Many of his songs rebuked intellectual pride and intellectual equipment as such and he is constantly advocating the grace of Rama as the only means of attaining bliss, the kirtana *Enu Chesthini* being typical of this outlook. Whenever there arose an opportunity as in his songs *Kasi Cheta* and *Rookalu Padivelunna,* he inveighed against the love of money and the love of possessions. Curious observers have detected a conscious approach to the Northern system of music in one or two of his songs and even an approximation to Western symphonies as in the song *Ramimchu varu* but in all but a few of his compositions he was an exemplar of the strictest technique of Carnatic music.

From the first he collected a band of devoted and

accomplished *sishyas* around him, one of whom Kanniah Bhagavatar, who visited Travancore impressed himself so much upon Maharaja Swati Tirunal that the most musical of monarchs sent his own court musician, Vadivelu, the violinist, to invite Tyagaraja to his capital. Tradition has it that there were many contacts between the Royal Musician and Sri Tyagaraja who seem to have profoundly appreciated each other's gifts but they unhappily never met. When Vadivelu approached Tyagaraja and stated that Swati Tirunal could bestow on him a great *padavi* or status he is said to have sung the kriti *Padavi Sadbhakti,* asserting that the state of mind which places implicit faith in Rama is the only *padavi* for which he craved. It may not be irrelevant at this juncture to refer in some detail to Sri Swati Tirunal, the Maharaja who reigned from 1829 to 1847 and who died before he was thirty-five but was able not only to fulfil the exacting duties of royalty during a troublous period but to compose descriptive poems and dramatic works of conspicuous merit in Sanskrit and also to create *varnams, kirtanams, padams* and *tillanas* in Sanskrit, Telugu, Malayalam, Canarese, Marathi, Hindi and other languages. His musical proficiency is as amazing and comprehensive as his mastery of several languages and the characteristic insertion of Swaraksharas bears testimony to both sides of his genius. Many of his compositions are sung all over South India and regarded as master-pieces although the authorship is not even known in some localities. Two of his *padams* epitomised the Ramayana and the Bhagavata and another, the Stalapurana Mahatmyam. In his court flourished Vadivelu, the master of *abhinaya* who was sent for from Tanjore, Sivananda, the *mridangam* player, Chinnayya and Eravi Varman Tampi, the composer of *Varnams.* He as well as his successors, were ardent exponents and lovers of the Bharata Natya and the art of Kathakali, and Chinnayya was one of the foremost masters of the dance.

Swati Tirunal and Vadivelu already referred to are said to have jointly composed a *varnam* in *Kapi* after the manner of Tyagaraja. The Maharaja encouraged proficiency in *thanams* which represent special modes of *raga* expression and were deemed to be the speciality of Parameswara Bhagavatar and for which Travancore has been famous right through. Swati Tirunal amongst his multifarious accomplishments and gifts shared the passion for style and verbal splendour which animated Syama Sastri and Muthuswami Dikshitar but he possessed in addition an absorbing devotion to Sri Padmanabha which was as inseparable from his work as the love of Sri Rama in Tyagaraja. Whereas before the times of Tyagaraja the *ragas* used for songs were not very numerous and it is computed that Jayadeva utilised less than twenty *ragas* in the whole of his *Gita Govinda,* both Swati Tirunal and Tyagaraja brought into vogue many *apoorva ragas.* At one and the same time at the court of Swati Tirunal there lived not only Vadivelu and many other experts who have been enumerated but the great Govinda Marar of whom more will be said hereafter and who came into personal contact with Tyagaraja. It is noteworthy that in his court also flourished Meru Swami, who was responsible for the introduction of *Harikathas* into the South and who also played a notable part in popularising Tyagaraja's kritis in Travancore. More than one member of the Royal Family patronised and took part in the Kathakali and one Maharaja was personally proficient in the art. As already stated, Kanniah Bhagavatar, the direct disciple of Tyagaraja, lived for many years in Travancore and he and his pupil Raghupati Bhagavatar and Natesa Bhagavatar were attached to the Maharaja's Palace. The indigenous style of music peculiar to Malabar and Travancore based on what is called the *Sopanam* system is now confined to temples and even the names of some of the tunes such as *inniva* and *puraneer* are referable to Dravidian origins,

the former word appearing both in Tevaram and Tiruvachakam. In this style of music, indigenous musical instruments were used such as *chembu, chenda, mlavu, nedunguzhal* and *idukka*. They are still part of the temple musical accompaniments in Travancore. It was in the reign of Swati Tirunal that Carnatic music became the dominant feature of musical life and the biggest contribution to that music was made by Swati Tirunal himself. It should also be remembered that one of his successors, Ayilyam Tirunal, was not only a scholar but a musician and patronised the great Maha Vaidyanatha Aiyar and Raghava Aiyar, who belonged to the generation next after Tyagarajaswami.

Amongst Sri Swati Tirunal's court musicians already referred to, one of the most accomplished was Govinda Marar, who was named "Shadkāla Govinda Marar" on account of his ability to sing *pallavis* adopted to six *kālas* or degrees of time. This Govinda Marar, notwithstanding that he was crippled by rheumatism, went on a pilgrimage to meet Tyagaraja, the meeting having been arranged by one Nallatambi Mudaliar who was a palace employee. His performances so enthralled Tyagaraja that he is reported to have composed his famous song *Entharo Mahanubhavulu* in honour of Govinda Marar to whom he gave the title "Govindaswami." This song avers: "Many indeed are the great ones of the world and to all of them I pay my homage." This and four other hymns in *Nata, Gowla, Arabhi* and *Varali* constitute the Pancharatnas.

The outstanding contribution of Tyagaraja in the domain of music was the development and systematisation of *sangatis* or melodic phrases in close assonance with the *bhāva* or the underlying emotion and he also released musical practice from the grip of the word as such. Some one has averred that his work was *kriti* as apart from *kirtana*. His services to the continuity of the Indian tradition are conspicuous. After him there has

been a little too much of emphasis on formal correctness and the musical value of notes, whilst at the same time purely musical values have not been preserved against non-musical intrusions. Tyagaraja himself represented a compendium of all the musical resources of his predecessors. It may be remembered that in his days the main instrumental accompaniments had not attained the position which they now enjoy and exact. The violin does not seem to have been much in use during Tyagaraja's time and it has been observed that there is no mention of it in any of his kritis. In Northern India its use is not as prevalent even now as in the South and in fact in this Presidency, the vogue of the violin really started with Tirukodikaval Krishna Ayyar, although in Travancore Vadivelu had largely popularised it. Krishna Ayyar along with the saintly Sarabha Sastri, who gave the lute a unique place in South Indian music and Narayanaswami of *mridangam* fame constituted the great names of the generation subsequent to Tyagaraja. According to tradition, Tyagaraja's main and simple accompaniment was the *tambura* and this was but appropriate in the nature of things to one who was essentially a Bhakta. It was fitting that Tyagaraja should have felt that his proper end and aim was *sanyasa*. Passionately devoted to his art he rose above it towards the end, although he had in the past insisted that music was essential for salvation in his lyrics, *Mokshamu Galada, Ragasudharasa* and *Enthuku Peddala,* and had insisted on all curricula of studies including music. His kriti *Aparthamuna norva* exemplifies the final attitude. "I have a wavering mind. I have begotten my difficulties. I composed and sang hundreds of kirtanas in order to obtain salvation for my individual self irrespective of others. I crave pardon and mercy for such great offences." The next step was to prepare for his death and his song in Manohari, *Parithapamukani* foretold his end and he prepared for it by *sanyasa* and surrender. He exclaims in it: "Oh

Rama, you appreciated my condition and have told me that in ten days you will save me. May I remind you of this promise?"

Gayakasikhamani Muthia Bhagavatar who, in his own person, typifies the confluence of many traditions and is equally honoured in his own district and in this, in Mysore and in Travancore, has in his short account in Sanskrit of the life and work of Tyagaraja described his musical output thus:

देशीकर्णाटसङ्गीताविचित्रसराणिस्पृशः ।,
त्यागराजनुतेत्यादि पदैरन्ते च मुद्रिताः ॥
अनरस्तोत्रसम्बन्धा अविष्णुस्तुतिवर्जिताः ।
बालैरपि सुगानांशाः पण्डितैरपि दुर्गमा. ॥
आपादचूडचार्वङ्गावेंदान्तार्थविजृम्भिता. ।
सर्वलक्षणसम्पन्नाः स्तुती रचितवांस्ततः ॥

These verses aptly outline the scope of Tyagaraja's art, his freedom from sycophancy and his devotion to his *Ishtadevata,* (Rama), his outer simplicity and the inner symbolism of his kritis, the felicity of his wording, compact, nevertheless with profound spiritual meaning and the technical excellence of his work.

With this description of his genius I may well conclude but may I take the opportunity of remarking before I finish that the memory of Tyagaraja should serve to minimise, if not to counteract, some of the tendencies now increasingly prevalent in the practice of Carnatic music? To say that at present the *'laya'* aspect is sometimes over-emphasised and the passion for *'tala'* overaccentuated and that legitimate regard is not paid to sheer melody and to the *Raghabhava* is certainly not to exaggerate. The present type of audience is new and in the making, and the present demands on the artists are variegated, and therefore is it that I have ventured on

such a reminder. "Often ornateness goes with greatness. Oftener felicity comes of simplicity."

Of Tyagaraja it may well be said in the words of the English poet:—

"Enough that there is none since risen who sings
A song so gotten of the immediate soul,
So instant from the vital fount of things
Which is our source and goal."